Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-056
Friday
22 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-056 *22 March 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 13 March 1991, Moscow domestic radio sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new radio sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

No Achievements Seen in Vienna Arms Talks *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Needs To 'Trust' Soviets on Arms *[Moscow International]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports on Churkin 21 March Briefing 2
Round-Up on Briefing 2
Concern Over Afghanistan Detailed 2
Foreign Minister To Visit 2
'Fraternal' Newspaper Chiefs Conference Ends *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

China

Rogachev Discusses Ties With Chinese Counterpart *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 4
PRC Grants Favorable Goods Loan to USSR *[Moscow Radio]* 4
Trade, Economic Protocol Signed With China *[TASS]* 4

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to Japan Previewed 4
Preparations Noted *[Moscow International]* 4
Seen as 'Major Turning Point' *[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]* 5
Japanese Envoy Edamura Comments *[Moscow International]* 5
Laverov Describes Tokyo Technological Exhibition *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 6

Southeast Asia

Commentaries Continue on Cambodia Settlement 6
UN Role Envisaged *[Moscow International]* 6
Thai Diplomatic Actions Noted *[Moscow International]* 7

Near East & South Asia

Anti-Iraq Stance in Gulf War Supported *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 11]* 7
Belonogov, Iranian Envoy Discuss Gulf, Ties *[TASS]* 8
Visiting Indian Official Holds Moscow Talks 8
Meets With Bessmertnykh *[TASS]* 8
Meets With Petrovskiy *[TASS]* 8
Vice President Yanayev Meets Indian Envoy *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 9
Sri Lanka Ambassador Ends Visit to Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 9

East Europe

Romanian Foreign Minister Pays Visit to Moscow 9
Churkin Comments on Significance *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 9
Begins Talks With Bessmertnykh *[TASS]* 9
Friendship Treaty Signed 22 Mar *[TASS]* 9
Talks Progress on Troop Withdrawal From Poland *[Warsaw PAP]* 10
Bessmertnykh Receives Yugoslav Ambassador *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 10

West Europe

British Foreign Secretary Hurd Visits 10
Begins Visit in Kiev 19 Mar *[TASS]* 10
Meets Ukraine Officials 20 Mar *[Kiev International]* 11
Arrives in Moscow 20 Mar *[TASS]* 11
Holds Talks With Bessmertnykh *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* 11
Holds Talks With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* 12
Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 12
Meets With Yeltsin 21 Mar *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* 14
Yeltsin Talks Described *[Radio Rossii]* 14
Departs 22 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Finnish Defense Minister Arrives in Moscow 14
Welcomed by Moiseyev *[TASS]* 14
Meets With Yazov *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Mar]* 15
Tours Soviet Union 20 Mar *[TASS]* 15
Genscher Interviewed on Soviet Policies, Ties *[TASS]* 15
Paper Reports Genscher 18 Mar News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 20 Mar]* 15
Nishanov Comments on Visit to Europarliament *[IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]* 16
Mixed Response Seen to Delors European Union Plan *[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]* 16

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

21 March Session Proceedings Reported *[Moscow TV]* 18
Resolution on Referendum Results *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* 19
Closed-door Session Continues *[Moscow Radio]* 20
Golik Reports Miners' Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 20
Action Taken on Miners' Strike *[TASS]* 21
Ban on 28 Mar Protest Urged *[TASS]* 21
Explanation Demanded for Journalists' Dismissal *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Deputy Says Moscow Should Be Capital District *[TASS]* 22
Youth Paper Apologizes to Lukyanov *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 22

Political & Social

First Secretary Summarizes Moscow Results *[Radio Rossii]* 23
Lukyanov Considers Referendum's Importance *[Moscow TV]* 23
Defense, Other Implications of Union Breakup *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 25
Krasnodar Group Urges Deputy Kalugin's Recall *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Mar]* 26
KGB Budget, Structure Examined *[MOSCOW NEWS No 10]* 27
Control Commission's Activity Described *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 29
Politicians' Popularity Poll Published *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 30
DPA Cites Interfax on Damage to Stalin Statue *[Hamburg DPA]* 31
Paper Satirizes Authorities Response *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 31
Building of Edifices Criticized *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 32
Correction to Officials' Meeting With Gorbachev 32

Economic

Text of Cabinet Price Reform Resolution *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 32
Shcherbakov Details Price Rises, Compensation *[Moscow TV]* 40
Commentary on Conservative Price Reform *[Radio Rossii]* 45
Gorbachev Alerted to Plight of Construction *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Mar]* 45
Nazarbayev Meets With Karaganda Coal Miners 47
3-Month No-Strike Pledge Secured *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 47
Nazarbayev Comments *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Chervonograd Miners Make Demands *[Kiev International]* 48
Donetsk Strike 'Gathering Monentum' *[Moscow International]* 49
50 Ukraine Coal Mines Continue Strike *[Kiev International]* 49
Oblast Court Rules Donbass Strike Illegal *[Moscow TV]* 49
Coal Industry Minister Contacts Miners *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Trade Union Leader To Meet Miners Half Way *[Moscow TV]* 49

Agricultural

Yeltsin, Silayev Issue Appeal on Land *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 11]* 49
Yeltsin's Appeal Rebutted *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 51

Scientific

Freight Craft Fails To Dock With Mir Orbiter *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Docking Postponed Until 23 Mar *[TASS]* 52

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic, Russian Deputy Ministers Discuss Relations *[Riga Radio]* 53
Party Committee, Commission Head Baltic Fleet *[Kaliningrad Maritime]* 53
Union Allegedly Dumped Chemical Weapons in Baltic *[Vilnius International]* 53
Churkin, Center Protest Danish-Latvian Protocol *[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]* 54
Denmark Rejects Soviet Rebuke *[Riga Radio]* 55
Latvian Deputy Cited on Need for 'Compromise' *[EKHO LITVY 12 Mar]* 55
Number of Participants in Latvia Poll Noted *[Riga Radio]* 55
Latvian National Minorities Law Well-Received *[Riga Radio]* 56
Lithuania Seeks 'Working Group' for Moscow Talks *[Vilnius International]* 56
Landsbergis 21 Mar Address on Recent Events *[Radio Vilnius]* 56
TASS Reports 'Troubled' Night in Vilnius 57
Lithuanian Official on Hotel Shooting Incident *[Radio Vilnius]* 57
Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Views Pugo Talks *[Radio Vilnius]* 57
Vagnorius Stresses Economic Links With Center *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Preliminary Vilnius Referendum Results Viewed *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 58
Lithuanian Reaction to Union Referendum Sounded *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Mar]* 59
European Parliament Delegation Visits Vilnius *[Radio Vilnius]* 59
Meets With Landsbergis, Kuzmickas *[Radio Vilnius]* 59

RSFSR

Khasbulatov Expresses 'Alarm' Over 'Hunger Riots' *[TASS]* 60
Komi Faces 'Extremely Difficult' Food Shortages *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Siberian Gold Mine On Strike for 'Economic Demands' 61
'Not Connected' to Coal Strikes *[TASS]* 61
Miners Resume Work 22 Mar *[TASS]* 61
Yeltsin Arrives in Leningrad; Talks With Media *[TASS]* 61
RSFSR Supreme Soviet 21 Mar Session *[Moscow TV]* 61
Discusses Social Guarantees *[TASS]* 62

Preliminary Results Tallied in Referenda Voting ... 62
Republic-Wide Results Reported *[TASS]* ... 62
Figures From Leningrad Okrug *[Moscow Radio]* ... 63
Mordovia's Voting Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 63
Prokofyev on Moscow 'Violations' *[Radio Rossii]* ... 63
Commentary on Counting Changes *[Moscow International]* ... 63
Presidium 'Reinterpreting' Referendum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Mar]* ... 64
Russian 'Arithmetic' Questioned *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 64
Prediction 'Did Not Come True' *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 65
Radio Rossii Jammed Before Vote *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 65
Silayev Addresses Media on Economic Program *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* ... 65
New Russian Peasant Party Discusses Platform *[IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]* ... 66
Deputies View RSFSR Extraordinary Congress *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 11]* ... 66

Western Republics

Tajikistan Introduces Joint Venture With U.S. *[TASS]* ... 67
Ukrainian Minister, Party Leader on Referendum *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 68
Ukrainian Leader Receives Romanian Ambassador *[Kiev International]* ... 68

Caucasus

Armenian 'Indignation' Over Nationalists' Actions *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 68
Cease-Fire Talks Conducted in Tskhinvali *[TASS]* ... 69
Pugo Sends Note to Supreme Soviet on S. Ossetia *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Mar]* ... 69
Georgian Legislature Discusses Referendum, Ossetia *[TASS]* ... 69
Georgian Legislators Expel Two CP Deputies *[TASS]* ... 69
Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Reviews First 100 Days *[VESTNIK GRUZII 21 Feb]* ... 70

Central Asia

Majority Favor Union in Turkmenistan *[Moscow TV]* ... 72
Alma-Ata City Soviet Elects New Leaders *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ... 73
Kazakh Legal Official on New Amnesty Law *[TRUD 16 Mar]* ... 73
Kirghiz, Uzbek Leaders Meet To Sign Treaty *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Mar]* ... 74

No Achievements Seen in Vienna Arms Talks

LD2103175891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, 21 Mar (TASS)—The second round in the new stage of Vienna talks on conventional armed forces, which ended here today, ran without achieving anything. On the agenda was the limitation of the number of armed forces personnel of the 22 member states from the Atlantic to the Urals, the formulation of a complex of efficient control measures for stabilization, and an agreement on the procedure for aerial inspection. The forum practically came to a halt.

The working structures for the talks have been preserved, but they were not activated. In the course of the present round, which started on 14 February, there were only three plenary sessions, and between the second and third there was an interval of a month. This time was used for unofficial consultations at the level of heads of delegations and individual experts.

What has happened? The talks have become a hostage to discussions revolving around one of the articles in the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe which was signed at the Paris summit meeting last November, and the matter at stake is the application of the rules for calculating the arms and technology to be reduced. The search for a way of resolving this set of questions was entrusted to a joint consultative group of experts from the 22 states that was working in Vienna. Incidentally, the group was set up for this very purpose in order to free participants in the talks from these concerns. Nevertheless, the problem of this joint consultative group was resolutely put up for discussion during the present round, which as a result, in essence did not take place.

The Soviet delegation considers that it would have been better not to burden the talks with unconstructive polemics, but rather to create normal conditions for the work and then carry it out. In its view, a resolution of the problems can be found. Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the delegation and special ambassador, told a TASS journalist that the USSR for its part is carrying out an intensive search for such solutions. However, it is important that the sort of concern, which can arise, does not turn immediately into a "crisis of confidence." There is no grounds for this. Now the main thing is not to halt efforts to find solutions to this problem, he emphasized.

The next round of talks on conventional armed forces in Europe is to start in mid-April.

U.S. Needs To 'Trust' Soviets on Arms

LD2103181291 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] In his speech in one of the subcomittees of the U.S. Senate, Ronald Lehman, the head of the arms control and disarmament agency, accused the Soviet Union of violating the conditions of the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe. The treaty, providing for a considerable reduction in offensive conventional weapons, was signed by the leaders of 22 countries in Paris last November, but owing to different interpretations of some of its provisions, the treaty's ratification is delayed. Yuriy Solton now comments:

Washington officials claim that the Soviet Union has taken three divisions with (?their) military equipment, including 3,500 tanks, out of the treaty's control. Experts should decide if these claims are justified.

Incidentally, during his last week's visit to Moscow, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker was informed about new Soviet proposals that may ensure a final solution of all the problems but the proposals failed to satisfy the secretary of state. Experts were then instructed to rework them in order to resolve the issue as soon as in the next few days. So, there is a chance to reach an agreement without any fuss quite calmly. Instead, Washington keeps putting forward demands at various levels to toughen the U.S. stand and questions the need to trust the Soviet Union. Honestly speaking, this can't help but arouse our concern. Statements of this kind play into the hands of those forces here and in the United States who are eager to frustrate the disarmament process. James Baker has actually admitted that the United States blocks the work aimed at finalizing the START agreement, though only two problems connected with it remain unsolved. And, in the Senate, the motion was tabled—which failed, though, to pass through—that the Soviet-U.S. ABM treaty be revised so that the Star Wars program could be carried on without any hindrance. All these facts, however, are pretty alarming, I find.

The logical question arises at this point: Isn't this the effect of the (?Persian) syndrome? As the U.S. press contends, after winning an easy victory over Iraq, the United States lost interest in disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. The authors of some articles claim that President Bush gave some of his advisers to understand that, for him, the START Treaty was no longer a sacred political and military symbol bound to ensure security as it once used to be. I don't know to what extent statements of this kind reflect the real state of affairs, but one thing is clear: the relations of trust established between the two countries can't be undermined; attempts to cast a shadow on Soviet-U.S. partnership—and such attempts are being made both in the Soviet Union and in the United States—can't be transferred to a state level. Trust is a pretty fragile thing, Yuriy Solton writes in conclusion.

TASS Reports on Churkin 21 March Briefing

Round-Up on Briefing

LD2103201191 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Oleg Polovko and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, March 21 (TASS)—Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase arrives in the Soviet Union tonight on a brief working visit, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

On Friday, Nastase is planning to hold talks with the Soviet foreign minister. They are expected to focus on preparing a Soviet-Romanian treaty on cooperation, good-neighbourly relations and friendship.

Churkin expressed concern over the sharpening situation in Afghanistan. Quoting numerous reports, Churkin said an offensive on the town of Khowst has been designed and implemented with the assistance of Pakistani special services and with the participation of Pakistani military advisers.

The Soviet side can only assess the actions as an "open desire to resolve the Afghan problem by" military means and a direct violation by Pakistan of its obligations under the Geneva accords," Churkin said.

Asked about the date for a Soviet-U.S. summit, Churkin said no new elements have emerged after U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's visit to Moscow. The two countries' presidents will agree on the date for the summit in the first half of this year, Churkin said.

Asked about the possibility for President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China, the spokesman answered in the negative. Such a visit has not been scheduled, he said.

Speaking about alleged promises by the Japanese side to render economic assistance to the Soviet Union in exchange for transferring several of the Kuril Islands to Japan, Churkin said no such proposals have been received in Moscow.

He said the islands issue will be discussed during President Gorbachev's visit to Japan. Before this, it will be discussed by the two countries' foreign ministers between March 29-31.

Outlining the Soviet Union's position on lifting sanctions against the delivery of food and non-military goods to Iraq, Churkin said civilians should not suffer from consequences of their leadership's policy. The problem is being discussed by the U.N. sanctions committee, he said.

Churkin confirmed that during recent talks in Moscow, including with the German and British foreign ministers, the sides actively discussed a Middle East settlement, including the Arab-Israeli conflict. "On the whole, we would like Israel's position to be more flexible, and we want it to help promote a Middle East settlement," he said.

Churkin said a scientific and practical conference had been held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry. The conference, devoted to the role of the United Nations in the 1990s and its place in the system of the Soviet Union's state priorities, was attended by representatives from the foreign political departments of Belorussia, the Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

Addressing the conference, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy noted that during the transition from the "cold war" to a new world order, the role of the United Nations as a universal mechanism for harmonising the interests and activities by members of the international community, is growing.

Concern Over Afghanistan Detailed

LD2103161891 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Oleg Polovko and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today expressed concern over the sharpening situation in Afghanistan.

Afghan rebels have launched a wide-scale offensive on the town of Khost, Vitaly Churkin told a briefing here today. Quoting "numerous reports from various sources", Churkin said the "offensive has been designed and implemented with the assistance of Pakistani special services, and there are Pakistani military advisers in rebel units".

The Soviet side, as a guarantor of the Geneva Accords, "can only assess the actions as a moral and material support to Afghan rebels", an "open desire to resolve the Afghan problem by military means and a direct violation by Pakistan of its obligations under the accords".

Churkin said that proceeding from its obligations "under the Geneva Accords and official statements, the Pakistani side "should refrain from interference in the civil war in Afghanistan" and display "good will and political reason in issues concerning an Afghan settlement". [quotation marks as received]

Such an approach "would be welcomed by the Soviet Union" and become "Pakistan's weighty contribution to strengthening peace and security in southwest Asia and improving situation in Asia as a whole", Churkin said.

Foreign Minister To Visit

LD2103153791 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Leg Polovko and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase arrives in Moscow on a brief working visit tonight, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

The schedule of his visit includes talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh. Both sides are expected to continue or, probably, complete the drafting of a treaty on cooperation, goodneighbourlyness and friendship.

'Fraternal' Newspaper Chiefs Conference Ends

PM1803150791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[M. Tretyakov report: "Until the Next Meeting"]

[Text] As has already been reported, leaders of socialist and East European countries' newspapers gathered in Moscow for their traditional meeting. It was held by PRAVDA.

Taking part in the discussion were R. Popov of DUMA (Bulgaria), F. Virag of SZABADSAG (Hungary), Chan Kiyen [name as transliterated] of NHAN DAN (Vietnam), Cho Dal-ye [name as transliterated] of NODONG SINMUN (DPRK), G. Cabrera of GRANMA (Cuba), Malayten Lotutkhun [name as transliterated] of PASASON (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Som Kimsuor and Kao Chyen [name as transliterated] of PRACHEACHON (Cambodia), Ts. Mishigdorj of UNEN (Mongolia), M. Siwiec of TRYBUNA (Poland), A. Karpychev of PRAVDA (USSR), L. Kazda of RUDE PRAVO (CSFR), J. Halas of PRAVDA (CSFR, Bratislava), B. Andrejic of BORBA (Yugoslavia), and V. Spickermann of NEUES DEUTSCHLAND (Germany).

The meeting's distinctive feature is frankness and comradeship. Any experience, even the most bitter, must be utilized for the good of the cause. This is precisely what the meeting participants talked about. They were unanimous that, in order to avoid getting confused in today's complex conditions, friendly ties that have been developing over decades must not be lost.

It was stressed that it is now necessary to strengthen and step up journalistic and information cooperation. Especially as it is easier to overcome the emerging difficulties together. And there are a lot of them. Just take the cut in newspaper correspondent posts abroad because of financial difficulties, the lack of foreign currency, the question of prompt exchange of information, and so on.

Summing up the meeting's results, I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and PRAVDA chief editor, stressed the fruitful nature of the discussion and of the exchange of opinions and experience, which, in his words, is of great importance.

An impromptu news conference took place at the conclusion of the meeting. I.T. Frolov answered questions from the meeting participants. They concerned the situation in the country and the CPSU, the forthcoming referendum, and the progress of perestroyka. He invited the fraternal newspapers to the traditional PRAVDA festival, which will take place in Moscow at the beginning of May this year.

China

Rogachev Discusses Ties With Chinese Counterpart

PM19031419911 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, who is in Beijing as part of a Soviet Government delegation, has held consultations with Tian Zengpei, PRC deputy foreign minister, on questions of Soviet-Chinese relations.

During the consultations specific questions of preparations for forthcoming Soviet-Chinese contacts were discussed. The timetable for future border talks between the two countries was outlined, and agreement was reached on the holding in April of the next round of talks on mutual armed forces cuts in the border zone.

PRC Grants Favorable Goods Loan to USSR

LD2003170791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] China has granted the Soviet Union a favorable goods loan in the amount of 1 billion Swiss francs, which is more than $700 million. For a period of a few months, grain, meat, meat products, tea, peanuts, tobacco, cigarettes, silk, textiles, and other light industry products will be supplied to the USSR. For a period of five years, apart from the first year, the USSR must pay back the loan with industrial goods and certain types of raw materials.

Trade, Economic Protocol Signed With China

LD2103131191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0429 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Fedoruk]

[Text] Beijing, 21 Mar (TASS)—A protocol between the USSR Government and the PRC on trade and economic cooperation in 1991 was signed in the Chinese capital today. It was signed by Aleksandr Kachanov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs and Tong Zhiguang, vice minister of foreign economic relations and trade of the PRC.

According to the accords, apart from purchases of goods for freely convertible currency, the two countries will also use barter trade. The volume of all agreements reached, in the view of the specialists, will make it possible to hope for the further growth of trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the PRC. China will supply the Soviet Union with food, tea, feed, and consumer goods. The Soviet Union, for its part, will supply China with machines, metallurgical equipment, oil products, and fertilizers.

One more interesting feature of the present protocol is that a mechanism has been worked out in it to activate direct ties between major Soviet enterprises that have the right to enter the international market and Chinese enterprises at various levels.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to Japan Previewed

Preparations Noted

OW2003131491 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 17 Mar 91

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] President Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan, which can be called an historical event, is only one month away. His visit is now drawing attention from a majority of people in both Japan and the Soviet Union. At present, the two countries are working vigorously on preparations for his visit. In the past few days, Soviet Deputy Premier Laverov visited Japan, the league of Japan-Soviet legislators was founded to promote friendship between the two countries, and talks were held between the two countries to discuss plans for the implementation of the cultural accord. There have been various reports on events related to the two countries. Various discussions were held between the two countries and a seminar on Soviet advanced technology was held in Tokyo for the first time, drawing great attention from Japanese industry. In an interview with NHK, Prime Minister Kaifu expressed his wish to build up relations of trust, friendship, and good-neighborliness with the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union has expressed his wish to put Soviet-Japan relations on a broader track and to raise them to a new stage by giving them an impetus. He is paying great attention to the progress of preparations for his visit to Japan. He has said that he intends to meet with as many Japanese leaders as possible during his stay. The preparations for the president's visit are likely to continue until the time he leaves for Japan. President Gorbachev also stated this in his message to a meeting at which the league of Japan-Soviet legislators was founded [as received]. Among recent events related to Soviet-Japan relations, the founding of the league has drawn particular attention. About 180 prominent legislators and politicians are now members of the league which was founded to promote Soviet-Japan relations to the maximum extent in various areas, and former Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita is a top adviser to the league. Speaking at the founding meeting, Keijiro Murata, chairman of the league, stressed that the Liberal Democratic Party, as a ruling party in Japan, should do its utmost to make the Soviet Union a close neighbor in various areas. A series of forward-looking remarks on the part of Japan demonstrate a warm climate fostered here on the eve of President Gorbachev's visit. Perhaps, this warm climate has been fostered by great expectations. For example, many observers see the president's visit as the best

historical opportunity to drastically improve Soviet-Japan relations and the Japanese public appears to share the observers' views. This situation has been created as a result of many efforts made and various agreements reached upon by the two countries. The situation indicates the genuine hopes of the two countries to make President Gorbachev's visit a success despite existing differences.

For the first time, the Japanese will see the very architect of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, which brought about a dramatic change in the world situation six years ago. Leaders of all the Western nations have held talks with President Gorbachev on many occasions and this has yielded positive results including the end of the cold war, and the start of the process of easing tensions. Therefore, I think that there are sufficient grounds to conclude that talks to be held between President Gorbachev and the Japanese leader in Japan in April will yield the same positive results.

This has been a comment on President Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan.

Seen as 'Major Turning Point'

PM2103122091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[From roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, BALTFAX, SIBINFORM, REUTER, UPI News Reports: "On Soviet-Japanese Relations"]

[Text] At a news conference in Tokyo, Sakamoto, general secretary of the Japanese Cabinet of Ministers, called the USSR president's impending visit to Japan "a major turning point of the last half century, which is called upon to shift Japanese-Soviet relations, which for a long time were in a cool and stagnant position, into a new and positive channel." Noting the desire to achieve a breakthrough in relations with the Soviet Union, at the same time, he confirmed Tokyo's unaltered intention to ensure that a solution to the territorial problem is "the first step in new and extensive links between Japan and the USSR."

Japanese Envoy Edamura Comments

OW2203142591 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Report on an interview with Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the Soviet Union, by weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; place and date not given]

[Text] In an interview with weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, Japanese Ambassador to Moscow Sumio Edamura, who places high hopes on President Mikhail Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan, states as follows:

There are high hopes among the Japanese that President Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan will become a historical event in Japanese-Soviet relations. They harbor these high hopes not simply because of the president's visit to Japan, but because of the great potential to be brought about as a result of his visit. Talks between Japan and the Soviet Union on the territorial issue have continued in a tug of war for decades. Of late, however, the changes that we have hoped for are appearing.

The Soviet Union has declared the new thinking policy and other policies of giving priority to the value of all mankind and international laws. Based on these policies, the Soviet Union has been able to change its conventional stance that the territorial issue does not exist between Japan and the Soviet Union. I hope that Japan and the Soviet Union, based on legal principles and constructive spirits, will make a quick move toward the final solution of the territorial issue, taking advantage of the president's visit to Japan. This result, which might be achieved by the president's visit to Japan, will be highly appraised by the Japanese.

With regard to the return of the Northern islands, a pending issue between the two countries, and Japan's economic aid to the Soviet Union as a reward for the return of the islands, I think we must not make light of the exchanges now under way between Japan and the Soviet Union. In Soviet external trade, Japan ranks third next to only Germany and Finland and in the amount of loans extended to the Soviet Union, Japan also ranks third next to Germany and France.

Needless to say, the improved political situation between the two countries will put their economic cooperation on a new stage. I think that what hampers the promotion of economic cooperation between the two countries lies not in politics, however, but in the domestic economic situation of the Soviet Union. To take the trade between the two countries, for example, Japanese enterprises have lost their confidence in their Soviet partners. Regarding the prospect of Japan's economic aid to the Soviet Union and the scope of Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation, I cannot definitely say what the prospect is at the moment. I would like to cite, however, Japanese-PRC relations. China obtained loans from the Japanese Government and the Export and Import Bank of Japan after the two countries settled political issues and concluded the peace and amity treaty in the late 1970s. Based on these developments, exchanges between enterprises of the two countries have since become brisk.

Before concluding the interview, Ambassador Edamura expressed his conviction that the Soviet people will find the breakthrough on their own. The ambassador added that to that end, the Soviet people need to make efforts and if these efforts produce results and create a good climate, the Soviet Union would be able to expand its economic cooperation with other foreign nations including Japan.

This has been a report related to President Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan.

Laverov Describes Tokyo Technological Exhibition

PM190317299l Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent I. Latyshev: "Exhibition of Ideas"]

[Text] Tokyo City, 13 Mar—There is a significant event in Japan's scientific and business life: A "Soviet Technologies" seminar-exhibition, organized by the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology with the assistance of the Japanese-Soviet Committee for Economic Cooperation, has opened in Tokyo in the capital's "World Import Mart" exhibition hall in Ikebukuro. The exhibition's aim is to familiarize Japanese scientific circles and firms with the achievements of Soviet scientists and designers in the fields of machine building, electronics, the creation of new chemical materials, medicine, and biotechnology.

Around 70 eminent Soviet scientists and designers came to Tokyo, most of them the authors of the technologies and scientific and technical developments being exhibited. All of them will deliver lectures at the seminar, in which over 200 Japanese specialists in the spheres of natural sciences and technology as well as representatives of business circles will take part. Opening the seminar-exhibition, academician N.P. Laverov, USSR deputy prime minister and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, expressed the hope that the seminar-exhibition's work will result in Soviet-Japanese commercial agreements and mutually advantageous contracts.

Speaking in response Shigeru Goda [name as transliterated], one of the leaders of the Japanese-Soviet Committee for Economic Cooperation and president of the "Sumitomo" machine building company, stated: "Lately, under the influence of perestroyka, we have seen progress in scientific and technical exchange between Japan and the Soviet Union. Both sides' constructive desire to combine the great achievements of Soviet experimental science with Japanese knowhow in putting these achievements into production is becoming increasingly decisive. I am sure that this event, which is being held during the month prior to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's arrival in Japan, will play a big part in the development of cooperation between our countries' institutions and enterprises."

In a conversation with your correspondent, answering a question about whether the Soviet developments brought to Tokyo could interest Japanese scientists and designers, academician N.P. Laverov said: "Japanese firms, which have a flair, as we know, for quickly taking up new technologies, showed great interest in the seminar-exhibition. I was really convinced of that. The lectures and exhibits that Soviet scientists brought to Tokyo are unusual and original developments. We are now holding meetings with representatives of the firms that are showing great interest in the exhibition. During these meetings the Japanese firms are also offering us new and interesting technologies. Therefore our stay in Japan is being accompanied by a strengthening of mutually useful and mutually advantageous contacts."

Southeast Asia

Commentaries Continue on Cambodia Settlement

UN Role Envisaged

BK2203060291 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas has disclosed that representatives of Cambodian parties would meet again in Jakarta. At this meeting Cambodian parties will discuss the plan to normalize the situation in Cambodia, otherwise called the draft agreement on Cambodia, which was worked out last year by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Our observer, Oleg Alekseyev, recalls that the five major powers' plan envisages an extensive use of the United Nations as mediator in carrying out concrete measures to normalize the situation in Cambodia, namely the plan to oversee free general elections under the UN representative's supervision. Earlier, people thought the draft agreement on Cambodia, which was adopted in the fall of 1990, has been accepted by the four Cambodian parties. Over the past few months, however, people have realized that the situation is in fact more complicated than this.

Lately, the Phnom Penh Government has set firm conditions on this plan. Most importantly, in Phnom Penh's view, this draft does not talk about preventing the Khmer Rouge from returning to power in Cambodia. Phnom Penh's concerns over the danger that the Khmer Rouge could return to power in Cambodia is understandable because this extremist group, which was in power in Cambodia in the second half of the 1970s, is guilty of massacring over three million of its compatriots. This is why the Phnom Penh Government strives to make any plan to normalize the situation provide reliable factors to ensure that the genocidal regime, that is the Khmer Rouge regime, is not resurrected.

As I said earlier, the five major powers' plan, in Phnom Penh's view, does not provide this. This plan is only a guidance. Considering the real situation, why not include all neceessary changes into the plan? As Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Igor Rogachev recently pointed out, it is this attitude that the Soviet Union has adopted for the situation. Facts have indicated that efforts of other countries involved also point to this direction.

On this issue, firm hope has been placed in Japan's new proposals, which, according to press reports, have provided factors ensuring that the Khmer Rouge do not return to power in Cambodia. As explained in Tokyo, these proposals have been put forward to supplement the

five major powers' plan. It is the Cambodian parties themselves, who will meet again in Jakarta soon, that will have the final say. This time around, can they agree among themselves? Just wait and see.

Thai Diplomatic Actions Noted

BK2203094391 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1300 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] All things considered, it appears that Thai diplomatic activities pertaining to Cambodia has declined in the past month. A Japanese news agency cited a senior Thai military official as saying that Thailand's role on Cambodia will be low profile, adding that for the time being the active role will be played by Indonesia, France, Japan, and the permanent UN Security Council members. This posture was confirmed by Thai Foreign Minister Asa Sarasin during his recent interview with THE NATION.

In short, the Thai administration has decided to curtail its role as a conduit for a settlement of the Cambodian problem, despite the active role played by the previous government of Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, and which saw instant results.

It will be interesting to see how relations between Thailand and the various Cambodian factions evolve. According to XINHUA, Foreign Minister Asa said Thailand wants its relations with the Phnom Penh government and the Cambodian resistance to be on the same level. But it is apparent that the Thai foreign minister has been trying to place the responsibility of obstructing peace in Cambodia on the Phnom Penh and Vietnamese governments. At the same time, he has not said anything about the role of the Khmer Rouge and its allies in fanning civil war in that country.

Is this a coincidence? The Thai foreign minister said the Thai commercial counselor's office in Phnom Penh will not established under the present circumstances. The Thai administration reportedly does not favor the idea of reconstruction in Cambodia before a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem is reached. Former Prime Minister Chatchai was receptive of this idea just before he was ousted from power.

All of this seems somewhat contradictory to Prime Minister Anan Panyarachun's remarks to the press on 19 March, where he said that the Thai Government intended to retain the previous foreign policy. It is no use jumping to conclusions. Prime Minister Anan has said that his government will present a detailed foreign policy to the National Legislative Assembly at the end of this month. But the Thai Government's real actions are more important.

Near East & South Asia

Anti-Iraq Stance in Gulf War Supported

91UF0569A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 11, 20 Mar 91 p 4

["Viewpoint" by Genrikh Borovik: "Of What Is Norman Schwarzkopf Guilty?"]

[Text] As the war on a shore of the Persian Gulf was only just unfolding in its first phase, a people's deputy, a likable young man, was all the while anxiously trying to prove to me:

"But Schwarzkopf is a German...."

"What of it?" I asked.

"How come?" the deputy was astonished. "The American Army is commanded by a German!"

The deputy was unable to express the sense of his anxiety in connection with Schwarzkopf's ethnic roots. I was simply unable to catch even some thread of logic in his question.

Just prior to 15 January—the last day when Husayn might still have begun the withdrawal of his forces from Kuwait—there appeared in the meeting hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet Xerox copies of a draft resolution printed on deputies' letterheaded note paper which proposed disavowal of the Soviet representative's signature beneath the UN Security Council resolution on sanctions against Iraq. It is hard to imagine even what would have happened in the world had this draft become a resolution of the Supreme Soviet!

Dark mystical suspicions are brewing with us: This person is to blame for everything, no, this one.

Schwarzkopf is only the start of it. The worst is yet to come. Closer to hand. They, the enemies, are right here, in the Kremlin. Just read certain publications. They are all named. For this two ladies, in appearance absolutely not worn down by everyday life, wrapped up warmly and well, at a February demonstration in support of the army quite intrepidly display in front of the press posters bearing the portrait of a top Soviet politician and statesman, known as an "architect of glasnost." His face is right at the center of a shooting target. The inscription: "We will not miss!"

The spirited ladies were right not to be afraid. No one will bring charges against them. The person portrayed at the center of the target will not bring suit, most likely, out of a sense of squeamishness. Those charged with putting a stop to such absurdity will remain silent, as though this is not their business, although instituting proceedings against the two asses and villains who palmed off on them posters calling for assassination is the direct concern of people in receipt of wages for performing this duty.

But proceedings are not brought against people in our country for public denunciation: this is undemocratic. Nor are people punished for public calls for the shooting of those whom a benighted intellect considers the enemy—this is glasnost.

A guest on a popular television program intones: "We have let Husayn down. We promised to help. But we have not helped. We lured him into a trap." The anchor asks: "Who promised?" The response—the guest's pursed lips and a meaningful look: You should know. As is frequently the case, we are in seeking an enemy looking in the wrong direction.

If anyone let Husayn down, it was only those who were counting together with him on the indecisiveness of the world community, that same indecisiveness that is being displayed by our law enforcement authorities in respect of those who transgress our laws. If anything let Husayn down, it was the hope that some highest authority might at the last moment pass a resolution declaring the signature of the statesman of this country in the Security Council invalid ("He is the one, the enemy, bind him!").

In connection with Iraq some people have reproached our foreign policy department for an unduly quick "reorientation": Today we cultivate friends and sell them weapons and tomorrow we disavow them. Truly, we need to be sensible in selling weapons, if we are to sell them at all. Denial of old friends is, indeed, not the best way to make new ones. But the situation does not always depend on us, it depends on the "friends" themselves also. The words of the poet, written, it is true, not in a foreign policy context, may serve as a response to such a reproach: "I also have at times lost friends. Not because I am scatterbrained but because there are friends who have to be lost."

Some people are counting on their fingers what the United States has won from all this. A considerable amount. But where is the proof that our country has lost? What would have been the "winnings" for us had all this happened 10 years ago, when we might, possibly, have backed Husayn to the death? It is appalling to contemplate.

The new world order has passed its first test. A tragic one. Even a very judicious order does not justify the violent death of a child. But it needs to be remembered who the true culprit of the bloodshed was.

The punishment of the aggressor averted, in my view, far more dreadful consequences, which could have resulted from the situation that had taken shape following the seizure of Kuwait.

This retribution, however, will, I am sure, be a powerful boost to a just solution of the entire set of problems of the Near East.

Belonogov, Iranian Envoy Discuss Gulf, Ties

LD1903225291 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 19 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov on Tuesday met Iranian Ambassador to the Soviet Union Nematollah Yazdi.

They discussed the situation in the Gulf and ways to settle the Gulf crisis. They also discussed bilateral relations.

Visiting Indian Official Holds Moscow Talks

Meets With Bessmertnykh

LD1903222391 Moscow TASS in English 2204 GMT 19 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on Tuesday met Indian First Deputy Foreign Minister Muchkund Dubey, in Moscow on a brief working visit.

They discussed a wide range of international problems and the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Indian cooperation.

While discussing bilateral relations, they noted that the Soviet Union and India valued their cooperation and friendship between peoples of the two countries, which is their common property. The sides are considering the development of relations as a priority in their foreign policy.

They noted with satisfaction that despite various difficulties in the international situation, positive trends prevail in the world aimed towards mutual understanding and interaction between peoples and states.

They agreed that a new impetus is needed for making the process of improving the international situation irreversible and reaching progress in disarmament, strengthening global and regional security and overcoming conflicts and crises.

Speaking about a postwar settlement in the Gulf, the sides noted similarity of their positions. They noted that U.N. mechanisms should be used in settling the crisis, proceeding from the understanding that countries of the region should play the main role and that coalition forces should be pulled out of the region.

Meets With Petrovskiy

LD1903222991 Moscow TASS in English 2139 GMT 19 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy on Tuesday met visiting Indian First Deputy Foreign Minister Muchkund Dubey.

In the light of a post-crisis settlement in the Middle East, they discussed prospects for disarmament in the regional

and global aspects. They discussed ways to invigorate the U.N. potential for strengthening international peace and security.

Vice President Yanayev Meets Indian Envoy

PM1903095391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 13 March USSR Vice President G.I. Yanayev received A.S. Gonsalves, ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR, at the latter's request.

In the course of a friendly conversation there was a frank exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions of Soviet-Indian relations.

Sri Lanka Ambassador Ends Visit to Moscow

PM1903115991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Rodney Clement Austin Vandergert, ambassador of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka to the USSR, left Moscow 14 March.

East Europe

Romanian Foreign Minister Pays Visit to Moscow

Churkin Comments on Significance

AU2103212891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2017 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, ROMPRES, 21/3/1991—Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase arrived on an official visit in Moscow Thursday [21 March] evening.

Emphasizing the significance of the visit, the director of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, Vitaliy Churkin, stressed in a statement to the ROMPRES correspondent that "Mr. Adrian Nastase's visit and the talks with Mr. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh are a continuation of the dialogue the two foreign minister started last February in Budapest". The importance of the visit results from the very content of the talks in Moscow, as they will focus on aspects of making final and preparing for signing a document of quite special significance the treaty of collaboration, good neighborliness and friendship between Romania and the Soviet Union. "I must stress," Vitaliy Churkin said, "that there is a permanent dialogue conducted by diplomatic channels between the USSR and Romania regarding the bilateral relations, with the treaty between the two countries being central to it. To our mind, the relations with Romania have to have a sound, lasting basis. Also, the two ministers will analyze a string of major issues of the current international life, Vitaliy Churkin concluded.

Begins Talks With Bessmertnykh

LD2203075191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0714 GMT 22 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Ryabikin and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)—Talks have started here between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his Romanian colleague Adrian Nastase, who arrived in Moscow yesterday evening on a short working visit.

It is being noted in Soviet diplomatic circles that in the course of the talks it is being proposed that the work should be continued and possibly completed on the drawing up of a treaty on cooperation, good-neighborliness, and friendship between the two countries. The ministers are exchanging opinions on issues of the further development of relations between the Soviet Union and Romania and on pressing international problems.

Adrian Nastase will also make up a trip to the Ukraine and Moldavia.

Friendship Treaty Signed 22 Mar

LD2203131691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 22 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Ryabikin and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)—Talks between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Adrian Nastase, foreign ministers of the USSR and Romania, ended here today by initialling a treaty on good-neighborliness and friendship between the two countries. The head of Romania's foreign political department arrived for a brief working visit here on Thursday.

The document, which is still to be signed by the heads of the two states, stresses the long-standing traditions in relations between the USSR and Romania and the fact of the two countries being neighbors. It reflects the processes of democratization which are taking place in both countries and also changes in the political climate of the whole European continent.

The initialled treaty confirms the positions of the USSR and Romania regarding the inviolability of borders, the territorial integrity of all European states, and the non-use of force in international relations as stipulated by the Helsinki Final Act. In this connection the sides undertake to promote the processes of strengthening security and trust which are taking place on the continent.

The document also envisions developing economic cooperation between the USSR and Romania at all

levels, expanding humanitarian and cultural exchanges, and cooperating in the struggle against terrorism and illegal drug trafficking. The treaty contains important provisions on cooperation in the sphere of environmental protection in the Danube and Black Sea regions.

Talks Progress on Troop Withdrawal From Poland

LD2103103891 Warsaw PAP in English 2302 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 20—Deputy Director of the Foreign Ministry's department and head of the Polish delegation Grzegorz Kostrzewa-Zorbas deemed talks on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland and the transit of the Western Group of Soviet Troops from Germany serious, creative and held in a very good atmosphere. The 5th round of talks, lasting two days, ended here today.

The Polish diplomat said that the talks concerned primarily the problem of transit because as regards the withdrawal of the Northern Group of Soviet Troops from Poland basically only the dates of starting and completing this operation remained to be agreed. Final decisions will be made during a meeting of the Polish and Soviet presidents to be held in the second half of April. Kostrzewa-Zorbas stressed that it was not the task of the delegations to accomplish a breakthrough in this question, although they exchanged new proposals and arguments.

The Polish representative said that 80 percent of the treaty on transit had already been agreed on and the remaining differences of opinion have, as he termed it, technical rather than political character.

During the present round of talks, both sides reached final agreement on railway fares that would compensate for all costs to be borne by the Polish side. These fares are based on rates accepted in Europe and calculated in Swiss francs. Kostrzewa-Zorbas observed that Poland neither wanted to make a profit on the transit nor could it lose on this burdensome operation. He recalled that both sides had given up road transit deeming it to be the most burdensome and difficult to organize.

The next round of talks will be held in Warsaw in the first half of April.

Bessmertnykh Receives Yugoslav Ambassador

PM2003164991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Meetings Held"]

[Text] On 19 March USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh received M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR, in connection with his forthcoming departure for home.

During the talk there was an exchange of opinions on the state and development prospects of Soviet-Yugoslav relations. The sides' mutual desire was voiced to expand and deepen them further.

West Europe

British Foreign Secretary Hurd Visits

Begins Visit in Kiev 19 Mar

LD2003164391 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 20 Mar 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Anatoliy Grigoriyev]

[Text] Kiev March 20 TASS—British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd has said his country is seeking to intensify relations with the Ukraine. He was speaking upon his arrival in Kiev on Tuesday.

Today, he continued familiarising himself with this, one of the largest Soviet republics. His stopover in the Ukraine is the first leg of his working visit to the Soviet Union.

Douglas Hurd held talks with Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk, Prime Minister Vitold Fokin and Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko. He was briefed on the political and economic situation in the Ukraine and on the results of two referendums held there—one on the future of the Soviet Union and the other on the place of the Ukraine as a sovereign state within the renewed Union. It was stressed that despite serious difficulties there was every ground for optimism.

Hurd was told about the Ukrainian leadership's attitude toward the new treaty of Union and relations between the republican and central authorities.

Douglas Hurd expressed hope that his visit would continue the good tradition of contacts, which was begun during the days of Britain in Kiev last year.

According to Hurd, mutually beneficial contacts should develop first of all along the lines of trade and cultural cooperation. He promised the British authorities would do everything to encourage British business people to set up joint ventures in the Ukraine. The secretary also favoured the opening of a British consular office in Kiev.

Douglas Hurd laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Park of Eternal Glory.

Later at Kiev University, the British foreign secretary delivered a lecture on the international situation and replied to numerous questions from the audience.

Meets Ukraine Officials 20 Mar

LD2103135591 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Today [20 March] the chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, Vitold Fokin, received the British Minister for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Douglas Hurd. A good beginning makes a good ending. This view of the new perspectives of cooperation between Ukraine and Great Britain voiced at the meeting could reflect the essence of today's dialogue, a dialogue between the leaders who came to their po[illegible] not long ago, but are already popular political figures i[illegible] their countries. The dialogue actually started last year after Margaret Thatcher's visit to Ukraine. Today this cooperation is gaining momentum. Douglas Hurd, in part, said:

[Begin recording] I was very anxious to visit the Ukraine, about which I have heard much, a country with which we in Britain are very keen to intensify our contacts. You were very kind to receive the British days festival last summer and Mrs. Thatcher visited with great pleasure, the Princess Royal [as heard]. So you have had many British visitors, and with your permission we wish to continue this tradition of British visits and British interest. We will do what we can to encourage British firms to come here. Culturally, here I am thinking of the British Council and the teaching of the English language. Third we are considering the question of opening a consulate here. It is not finally decided, but I hope that we will be able to take a decision fairly soon now. So in those three ways we are anxious to press ahead with our relationship. In that context I would very much like to hear, prime minister, as you say, how you see both the political and the economic developments in the Ukraine. [end recording]

The British minister for foreign and commonwealth affairs, Douglas Hurd. Next to speak was Ukraine's prime minister, Vitold Fokin. He said:

[Fokin is heard briefly in Russian, fading into English translation] Ukraine is also very much interested in this development of versatile ties with your country. The Ukrainian Government is currently busy working out a special program of overcoming a crisis situation in this republic. What we have today is broken up economic ties and an extremely unbalanced consumer market. The situation has been aggravated by the miners' strike. The figure of the striking mines yesterday was 49 out of 241 mines of Ukraine. Nevertheless, we are looking into the future with optimism. We believe in the Ukraine's potential for stability, and I think the one who today, despite the grave economic situation of Ukraine, still believes in the possibilities of this republic, and wants to become its partner, will in the very near future be rewarded with great benefits. The risk is not too big, because our republic takes the first place in Europe in the output of iron ore, cast iron, steel, mineral fertilizer, and sugar; the second place in gas and coal production. In case international ties, exchange of ideas, technologies, know-how are established now, I believe the situation may speedily stabilize, said Vitold Fokin.

The British minister for foreign and commonwealth affairs, Douglas Hurd, invited the Ukraine's prime minister, Vitold Fokin, to visit Great Britain as a guest of his government.

Arrives in Moscow 20 Mar

LD2003164691 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, having completed his tour of the Ukraine, arrived in Moscow from Kiev today.

On Thursday, Hurd will hold talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksander Bessmertnykh and is expected to meet with President Mikhail Gorbachev.

On the same day the British official will hold a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Holds Talks With Bessmertnykh

PM2203144591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-British Talks"]

[Text] Talks were held in Moscow 21 March between USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary D. Hurd, who is on a working visit to the Soviet Union.

In the light of the results of the meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and British Prime Minister J. Major at the beginning of March, the exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions of interest to the two countries was continued.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the Soviet-British political dialogue is building up its potential, and bilateral relations are developing steadily and dynamically, are being built on a healthy, nonconfrontational basis, and are acquiring the nature of a partnership. They are becoming a weighty factor in the matter of asserting a new, more harmonious international order.

The sides agreed to continue developing political interaction and promoting the expansion of trade, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural ties and humanitarian cooperation. The British side emphasized its support for the Soviet leadership's policy of implementing fundamental reforms in the country and expressed readiness to promote the Soviet Union's involvement in the mechanisms of world economic ties.

Chief attention in the talks was devoted to comparing the two countries' conceptual approaches and practical policy on major international problems.

During a discussion of the lessons of the crisis in the Persian Gulf region the British side made a high assessment of the Soviet Union's principled line aimed at fulfilling the UN Security Council resolutions. The ministers emphasized the need to concentrate efforts now on creating a reliable security system to ensure peace and stability in the region. Such a system must be formed, above all, by the states of the region themselves with appropriate UN participation. The Soviet side emphasized that it cannot be a closed structure directed against anyone whatever.

In connection with the conflict in the Persian Gulf the need for the speediest, comprehensive settlement in the Near East—which was advocated by both ministers—has become still more obvious. The establishment of a more reliable missile and missile technology nonproliferation regime is acquiring special topicality, as is the question of reducing deliveries of all types of arms to that region.

During a discussion of European problems the ministers advocated broadening and deepening the Helsinki process in all areas and improving the mechanism of all-European cooperation.

Questions which have arisen in connection with the Treaty on the Reduction of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe were touched upon. The Soviet side voiced confidence that some new ideas in this regard, which it formulated recently, will make it possible to eliminate the concern which has been expressed.

The ministers agreed to continue contacts on the main problems of Soviet-British relations and world politics.

D. Hurd invited A.A. Bessmertnykh to pay a visit to Britain. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Holds Talks With Gorbachev

PM2203113791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting with D. Hurd"]

[Text] On 21 March the USSR president met with Douglas Hurd, British secretary for foreign and commonwealth affairs. This was essentially a continuation of the dialogue recently begun so successfully between M.S. Gorbachev and Prime Minister J. Major. The conversation was held with a high assessment being made of the substance and nature of that first top-level meeting, which signified confirmation of the continuity of Soviet-British relations and strengthened the favorable prospects for their further development. Continuity is also confirmed, M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, by the fact that the foreign policy department is headed by a man such as D. Hurd.

Since the British secretary has also come to familiarize himself with the situation in the country and since he had begun thorough talks with A.A. Bessmertnykh, the conversation with the president was devoted mainly to the results of the referendum in the USSR.

Taking an interest in this topic, D. Hurd declared that Britain supports the reforms which are associated with Gorbachev's name and which have already been of great benefit to the whole world. The United Kingdom is not interested in the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Instead, it wants the Soviet Union preserved and intends to do business with it, albeit in a modified form.

The president noted the importance of such a position. It merits great attention and attests to the trust and mutual understanding of two great states.

He painted a detailed picture of the situation in which the referendum was held. Its results make it possible to move more quickly toward the Union treaty, to reform the Union, and, at the same time, despite all the difficulties, to advance the profound economic reform and take the perestroyka-charted path of democratic transformation of social and political structures. Attempts to undermine these efforts could, of course, slow down the process and require tougher forms of realizing the policy of perestroyka. But the aims and principles remain unchanged.

The draft treaty is profoundly democratic, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, provides for various forms of relations between the center and even those republics which remain within the Union, and proceeds from the need for a clear-cut distribution of competence, powers, and responsibility.

The interlocutors agreed to continue contacts at various levels on all urgent questions of the contemporary international situation.

Participating were A.A. Bessmertnykh, A.S. Chernyayev, R. Braithwaite, and R.H.T. Gozney.

Holds News Conference

LD2103193691 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—Douglas Hurd, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, addressed a news conference here today, held after his meeting with President Gorbachev. He said that his conversation with Gorbachev had been focused almost totally on domestic problems.

Hurd pointed out that all he had heard from Gorbachev, Yeltsin and other officials in Moscow had made him realise that the Soviet Union was living through a very difficult month, and nothing indicated an easy way ahead and a rapid advance. Britain supports the continuation of reforms, which it links with the name of Mikhail Gorbachev. Britain favours the continued existence of the Soviet Union—a renovated and voluntary

Union. This would meet common interests. He pointed out that British senior officials were friends of reforms and people, who believe in the development of contacts between governments and nations.

Douglas Hurd, who is staying in the Soviet Union on a working visit, had conversations today with President Mikhail Gorbachev, Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Chairman of the Russian legislature Boris Yeltsin.

Hurd said at the news conference that he was very much satisfied with his visit. He pointed out that he had discussed with Bessmertnykh the efforts that the Soviet Union and Western countries should exert together with regard to the Gulf problem. According to Hurd, during the discussion of that problem tactical differences had emerged from time to time, but on the whole the discussion had been fruitful. The sides also discussed the Arab-Israeli problem, problems dealing with disarmament, specifically those dealing with the agreement on conventional armaments, as well as many other European problems.

Hurd said that he had discussed with Soviet officials various issues dealing with bilateral relations, which stem from the mutual desire to boost relations both with the USSR in general and with individual Union republics integrated in it. He announced in this connection that a British Consulate would be opened in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine. He stressed that this decision had been taken on the basis of reciprocity.

Douglas Hurd said that he had discussed with Moscow officials problems connected with the fact that some British firms are not receiving payments. He pointed out that the Soviet foreign minister had promised to tackle this problem.

Responding to the question about the lack of symmetry, created in Europe because of the termination of existence of the Warsaw Pact military organisation, Hurd said that he had not discussed this problem here in Moscow. At the same time, he pointed out that NATO would be preserved. NATO member countries decided, first, to change NATO and, second, to preserve this organisation. The transformation process is now being worked out within the NATO framework. Hurd said that he had discussed it in detail with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh. It was part of the discussion which is under way in Western countries and the West European Union. NATO is revising its functions, he added. Of course, NATO member states plan to preserve the level of armaments and the strength of troops. The U.S. and Canadian presence, the allied command of nuclear and conventional armaments, that form the basis of NATO, will be preserved. NATO membership will not be expanded.

Touching upon his conversation with Boris Yeltsin, Hurd said that they had discussed the developments that had taken place since last September, Yeltsin's plans and his concept of the future. According to Hurd, it was a very interesting conversation.

Commenting on his conversation with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Hurd said that, by all appearances, it would be easy to establish effective working relations with his Soviet counterpart. He knows all problems, arguments and their history, he pointed out. Hurd and Bessmertnykh decided to keep in touch by telephone.

Speaking about the arms control treaty, Hurd pointed out that although there remained some questions to which answers were not yet found, he was not pessimistic about it. At [word indistinct] time, he said that tremendous progress had been achieved in Moscow on human rights issues.

Hurd said that during his talks with Bessmertnykh they had discussed in detail the differences that had emerged in connection with the interpretation of the third article of the treaty on the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe. He pointed out that this problem could not be settled on a bilateral level by the USSR and one of the signatories to the treaty. Hurd believes that it should be settled by all those who signed the treaty.

Pointing to a different interpretation of the third article by the Soviet Union and Britain, Hurd said at the same time that the two sides had some ideas on possible ways of overcoming the differences. They agreed to work together for achieving it as soon as possible.

Speaking about the two countries' approaches to the settlement of the Middle East situation, Hurd pointed out that they were very close. According to Hurd, the USSR and Britain believe that it would be necessary to hold an international conference on this problem and draw the United Nations into this process. Both sides are satisfied with the initiative of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on the settlement of the conflict. Hurd said that the Palestine Liberation Organisation could not be removed from the quest for a solution to the Middle East conflict, because it continues to be held in high esteem by many Palestinians.

Responding to the question about prospects of Western economic assistance to the Soviet Union, Douglas Hurd said that they had not found so far a programme of economic reforms, implemented in the USSR, that would justify, in their opinion, significant volumes of Western aid. He added, however, that West European countries had decided to meet some concrete demands with the help of a package of measures worked out in Rome last December, specifically, on the problem of food deliveries and technical assistance. The rendering of this assistance was suspended in connection with the developments in the Baltic region, but now the working out of the package for food and technical assistance is continuing. According to Hurd, these specific programmes are not connected with the overall economic assistance.

Asked about a possibility of the establishment by Britain of diplomatic relations with the Baltic republics, Hurd said that Britain did not plan to create diplomatic missions or change the character of contacts. Contacts will certainly be intensified within the framework of visits of legislative delegations and along other lines, he said.

Meets With Yeltsin 21 Mar

PM2203101591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[ROSTASS report: "B.N. Yeltsin's Meeting with D. Hurd"]

[Text] On 21 March a meeting was held in Moscow between B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and D. Hurd, British minister of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs.

At the guest's request the head of the Russian legislature set out his view of the present situation in the country and in the republic. The analysis which he made continued with an exchange of opinions on the subjects touched upon and the secretary received replies to his questions.

Yeltsin Talks Described

LD2103204291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1930 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Our legislative correspondent, Yelena Kuznetsova, met Kozyrev, Russia's foreign minister. This short interview concentrated on the outcome of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's meeting with Douglas Hurd.

[Begin Kozyrev recording] The meeting undoubtedly shows just how the Russian factor is coming to be of more and more significance, and demonstrates an acknowledgement of the importance of maintaining contacts. This is the second time the foreign secretary has visited us here on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment. The most substantive issues were touched on. Not unnaturally, everyone was interested in the outcome of the referendum, the future of the Union, and the future of the reforms. Boris Nikolayevich dwelt on this in detail, stressing that we have plans of our own and a progam of our own for economic reform and for the reorganization of the Union on more democratic principles. He dispelled all the apprehensions that certainly do exist in the West as to the possibility of civil war or the uncontrolled collapse of the Union. He stressed that we are categorically against civil war, and, generally, that he does not believe there could be civil war here—that there is no reason for it. He rejected the idea that we are pulling down the Union—we are not pulling it down; quite the contrary, we are strengthening the Union, only on fresh conditions.

In the field of foreign policy, this will undoubtedly have a positive affect on the international situation. By and large, I believe that without this meeting his level of being informed would be rather one-sided and incomplete. I fear he left with a heavy heart and with the apprehension that something terrible was about to happen, that an abyss was looming, and that there were no forces capable of switching to democratic processes. Now he realizes that there are indeed such forces and that they are concentrated here in Russia, but that they are not against the center, but are in favor of the center acting (?in the interests) of all, embarking upon the path of reform, and cooperating with Russia relying on this and emerging with positive (?changes). [end recording]

Departs 22 Mar

LD2203105491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] Douglas Hurd, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs of Great Britain, left the Soviet Union today. He has been on a working visit in our country.

The visit by the head of Great Britain's foreign policy department was a continuation of the practice of Soviet-British high-level contacts. It took place to develop the recent meeting between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and British Prime Minister John Major.

The results of Douglas Hurd's talks in Moscow will serve the further strengthening of the Soviet-British dialogue and will consolidate the mutual understanding and trust in bilateral relations that has been achieved in the past few years.

Finnish Defense Minister Arrives in Moscow

Welcomed by Moiseyev

LD1803135491 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Sergey Petukhov]

[Text] Moscow March 18 TASS—Chief of Staff of the Finnish defence forces Lieutenant-General Gustav Hegglund arrived here for an official visit today. At the airport he was welcomed by Chief of the Soviet General Staff General Mikhail Moiseyev and other officials.

In the afternoon Hegglund met General Moiseyev. Their talk focused on military relations between the USSR and Finland and on the military and political situation in Europe in light of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from eastern Europe and dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty military organisation.

"The Soviet people and their armed forces entertain feelings of sincere friendship and liking for the Finnish people and representatives of the Finnish defence forces," Moiseyev told TASS after his talk with the Finnish guest.

According to the Soviet general, both sides are working to "make the world more stable and safe". Moiseyev believes the stability of Soviet-Finnish relations could contribute considerably to the solution of this task.

"Our mutual understanding and cooperation play an important role in promoting stability and peace in northern Europe and on the continent as a whole," Moiseyev stressed.

Meets With Yazov

PM2003150791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] On the same day [18 March] USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov met with Lieutenant General G. Hegglund [chief of the Main Staff of Finland's Defense Forces]. During the conversation they discussed certain problems of strengthening security, above all in the north of Europe, along with a series of questions relating to Soviet-Finnish military contacts.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev also met with Lt Gen G. Hegglund.

Army Gen M.A. Moiseyev gave a dinner in honor of the Finnish guest.

Tours Soviet Union 20 Mar

LD2003101991 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 20 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Sergey Petukhov]

[Excerpt] Moscow March 20 TASS—Lieutenant General Gustav Hagglund, chief of the main defence headquarters of Finland, now on an official visit here, has left for a tour of the Soviet Union today.

At the airport he was seen off by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR, [and] other officials.

Hegglund will pay a two day visit to Leningrad. He will visit the naval academy and the museum of artillery, engineer troops and communication. He will also be sight-seeing in the city on the Neva River and its suburbs. [passages omitted]

Genscher Interviewed on Soviet Policies, Ties

LD2003141991 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] Bonn March 20 TASS—The Soviet Union continues to pursue its reliable foreign policy, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said in an interview with the Norddeutscher Rundfunk radio station.

"The Soviet president is our partner, and we consider it important to strengthen and broaden German-Soviet relations," Genscher said. "Especially now that the Soviet Union faces serious problems of the transitional period, these relations acquire particular importance for our two countries and the whole of Europe."

President Gorbachev's policy has given a new impetus both to foreign political and domestic political development. Gorbachev is a strong personality, and he will pursue his course, Genscher said.

Paper Reports Genscher 18 Mar News Conference

PM2003093591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent G. Charodeyev: "Visit Was Particularly Important; From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] On the eve of his departure from Moscow, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG vice chancellor and foreign minister, met with Soviet and foreign journalists. This visit, he stressed in his speech, is of particular importance: "This is my first visit to the USSR as head of the foreign policy department of a united Germany." The talks with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev lasted almost three hours and those with USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh lasted seven hours. H.-D. Genscher expressed satisfaction with the Soviet Union's policy, which has led to a fundamental change in the entire situation in the world. In his words, it has made it possible to overcome the split in Europe and to achieve German state unity.

"We are profoundly convinced," he continued, "that in order to bolster confidence in Europe it is important to further develop relations between the United States and the USSR. We have no fears in this regard. We are also well aware of our own heft in relations with the Soviet Union....

"During a discussion on bilateral relations I told the president about my discussion with representatives of Germans living on Soviet territory. They expect that the question of the revival of Soviet Germans' autonomy will soon be resolved. They would view such a formation as an important sign for the future with regard to life in the USSR. I wish to stress that the FRG has an interest in the Germans' staying here in the Soviet Union. They would not have sufficient opportunity to find their feet in the new conditions in Germany. We will do everything to help the Soviet Union on this matter within existing laws. For instance, Germany will give its kinsmen help in the sphere of education, culture...."

H.-D. Genscher went on to state that the talks with the USSR president had touched on the question of a

portentous date—the 50th anniversary of the invasion of the Soviet Union by Hitler's troops. It was agreed that consultations would be held. The FRG would like to mark this event properly, which would be in keeping with the moral, human, and historical dimension and would serve to develop bilateral relations.

The FRG foreign minister also reported that he put forward with great seriousness the federal government's position on Honecker's presence in the Soviet Union. "I think," H.-D. Genscher stressed, "that Gorbachev is well aware of the importance being attached to this fact in Germany."

It was stated at the news conference that the exchange of opinions on the entire range of bilateral relations would be continued in Germany.

Nishanov Comments on Visit to Europarliament

PM2003133891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report on interview with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yu. Kovalenko in Strasbourg; date not given: "At the Invitation of the Europarliament"]

[Text] Paris—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, visited Strasbourg at the invitation of the European Parliament. The delegation had meetings with E. Baron, speaker of the Europarliament; J.-P. Cot and V. Giscard D'Estaing, the leaders of its socialist and liberal factions; J. Delors, chairman of the EC Commission; and representatives of all 12 member states of the assembly. It also participated in sessions of the Europarliament delegation for relations with the Soviet Union.

"During our meetings in the Europarliament," R.N. Nishanov told IZVESTIYA's correspondent at the end of the visit, "discussion centered first and foremost on the complex processes of perestroyka in the Soviet Union—particularly in the field of economics, the occurrences of interethnic conflict in various regions of the country, the new Union treaty, and the referendum.

"Our interlocutors showed great interest in the Union's future structure. For their part, they declared themselves in favor of a unified and renewed Soviet Union, and emphasized that it was advantageous for them to have dealings with a strong country that plays a stabilizing role not only in Europe, but in the world as a whole. In his meeting with us, Jacques Delors stated: It is staggering that at a time like now when strong integration processes are proceeding in all areas, and the creation of political and economic and currency unions is in preparation, you are running off to your national compartments."

[Kovalenko] "What do we expect from the development of collaboration with the European Parliament?"

[Nishanov] "What is important for us is an exchange of opinions with legislators of the 12 states on questions of improving legislation, the legal foundations, and socioeconomic development. Under the circumstances of our creating a rule-of-law state, the experience of the West European states, whose parliaments have existed for 200-300 years, has exceptional significance for us. There is yet one more important element: They can exert influence on their countries' leaders, on the European Community at the level of expanding economic aid to us, technology exchanges, and improving trade links. Apart from this, the Europarliament deputies speak in favor of the broad participation of the Soviet Union in the all-European process, and intend to facilitate the successful implementation of various measures within the CSCE framework. The temporary restrictions on the provision of food aid by the EEC were lifted during our stay in Strasbourg. Provision was also made for the appropriation of significant resources to the Soviet Union for the purchase of food, technology, and equipment.

"If we are to talk about the longer term," R.N. Nishanov emphasized, "then you have to mention the possibility of the Soviet Union joining in with the integration processes in the Old Continent, in particular in the field of environmental conservation, power engineering, telecommunications, the carrying out of scientific research, and cultural collaboration."

Mixed Response Seen to Delors European Union Plan

PM2203145591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent B. Moskvichev: "United States of Europe Again on the Agenda"]

[Text] Brussels—The speech by EC Commission President Jacques Delors at London's Institute of Strategic Studies, where he stressed the need to strengthen the European pillar of NATO and create European multinational forces, has caused a mixed reaction in the international community.

The program of building a unified economic, political, and military Europe presented by Jacques Delors is undoubtedly in accord with the interests and desire of Europeans to become more independent vis-a-vis their transatlantic leading partner.

The latest program statements by Jacques Delors were on the whole greeted with approval in the NATO leadership. At the alliance's headquarters it is considered

that they perform a good service to the harmonizing of relations among the EEC, NATO, and the WEU.

In Washington, however, the allies' standpoint is not shared. On the contrary, there they consider that Delors' proposals undermine the unity of the North Atlantic alliance and pursue the aim of weakening the U.S. role and influence in Europe.

Touching on this topic, William Taft, U.S. representative in NATO, noted that Americans support the idea of the European pillar of the bloc, but its implementation should not lead to a split in the alliance.

The proposals made by the EC Commission head in London and then on Radio Europe 1 have not gone unnoticed in the leading European capitals. Observers note that Delors' ideas have received support in France, which has advocated the urgent convening of a summit conference of the Twelve to discuss all the basic spheres of Europe's future role. The idea of creating European multinational rapid deployment forces has been received with approval in Paris.

In specialists' estimation some changes are also underway in the policy of Britain, where the new prime minister has recently been demonstrating signs of agreeing to a pro-European policy.

Supreme Soviet

21 March Session Proceedings Reported

LD2103221591

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1916 GMT 21 March carries a recorded account of proceedings at the 21 March session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin, Moscow.

Vladimir Orlov, chairman of the central commission for the referendum, provides further information about the results of the 17 March referendum. This information is more up-to-date but is not yet the final official result. He reads out the figures for participation and for those voting "yes" in all the various republics. Some republics, he continues, did not organize the referendum officially, but efforts by various citizens made it possible for some to vote. Orlov gives voting figures for Georgia, the Baltics, Moldova, and Armenia. Citizens abroad were also able to vote. The referendum can be regarded as a success. Difficulties were created for those wanting to vote in some republics. The commission thanks deputies for their help. Some mistakes were made and these will have to be looked into but they did not affect the result of the referendum.

At 1929 GMT the deputies debate the referendum results. A female deputy calls for a statement on the referendum to be adopted and calls for Gorbachev to take stricter measures to end the war of laws and insure law and order. Another deputy criticizes the propaganda for a "no" vote that took place in the Ukraine. In spite of this, there was a large vote in favor of the union. (voting figures not given) Deputy (Kocharov) says that the referendum marked the defeat of the forces of destruction. He opposes the plans to raise prices. Deputies should act in the interests of the people. He proposes detailed extensions of the goods whose prices should be regulated.

At 1937 GMT Deputy Aleksandr Dzasokhov speaks:

"In my opinion, saying that there are no other cares apart from care about the mother country bears a special meaning today. Ours was an all-Union referendum but in its essence it has a worldwide significance. All the Soviet embassies and foreign missions—and there are 127 in addition to six attached to international organizations—have confirmed in their dispatches in recent days that highly intense interest in the preparation and holding of the referendum itself was shown abroad. Of course, the tone of this interest has a broad spectrum. But summing up the results of the referendum today, I would like to announce to the members of the Supreme Soviet that the general trend is that the constructive states and political figures—those who are actively and those who are not yet actively cooperating with our country—have sighed with relief because the Soviet Union, one of the largest states regarded as a great power, will remain on the world stage with all its realized and possible potentials. Foreign politicians—and this coincides with the observations of our Soviet scholars—have noted that the decision on holding the referendum at a time that is complicated in the political, social, and economic senses was a bold one, and its results confirm the firm course the Soviet leadership has taken toward the continuation of the democratic reforms. Our referendum also had wide resonance because similar processes are taking place in a whole number of states. Only a few months ago we could not foresee the centrifugal tendencies on such a scale in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The restless echo of centrifugal tendencies had its resonance in Canada, in Belgium in India, in Ethiopia, and in many other states.

"I should also like to inform you that, perhaps in the wings of this dynamic atmosphere, unusual events were happening during these days, namely in many republics there were foreign observers the majority of whom, I believe, arrived on a goodwill mission—in the name of the Helsinki process, the Paris meeting. But at the same time, among our guests there were quite a number who would like to present the results of the referendum in disturbing tones. I would like to fully support the addresses of my colleagues who call for drawing the appropriate conclusions for the near and distant future in order to fill the meaning of our citizenship of this multinational and unique country with conscious patriotic behavior, especially at the official level. It is difficult to explain for ourselves and, moreover, for foreign figures, that after the adoption of the collective decisions on such fundamental questions as a referendum, many high-ranking political and state figures in the capital and in other places continue to question the set wording, and probably still remain superficial supporters. Elementary logic and the method of realization of this means that we should withhold our personal laboratory research at the legislative, political, and other levels. I would like to say by this that we ourselves have sown many doubts on the eve of the referendum.

"One more thing, comrades. I think now that beneficial conditions have been created. Besides, the level of activity of the Soviet voters, although it is unusual for us—we are used to 99 percent—in other conditions of formal behavior, it is much higher than in similar cases in countries with long-established democracy. The presidents of some great powers have been elected by 27 percent of the registered voters. We had a high level of activity shown. Therefore we now have a moral right to really equip our programs with specific organizational measures. Therefore the suggestions to draw up a specific program based on the general positive results of the referendum, which were put forward here, are in my opinion extremely timely and require that our parliament show interest in involving itself in this.

"And the last point. There is a need—and probably our esteemed chairman of the [referendum] commission will agree—that in the context of the exchange of views some provisions should be added to the draft decisions, including those of international aspect. I shall forward these suggestions in writing."

At 1945 GMT Nishanov puts forward a draft decision on the referendum. This is later passed. (voting figures not given)

At 1946 GMT the deputies move on to the next point on the agenda, the draft basis of civil legislation. Deputy Kalmykov puts forward the draft. He explains what is meant by civil legislation. It deals with market relations. It should be valid throughout the whole union. It does not infringe the rights of republics but helps them to act in a coordinated manner. In market conditions securities are important and should be covered by legislation, which is not the case at present. The legislation covers property relations. A new feature is that if someone possesses something in good conscience for a specified period of time, it becomes his property.

There are only two articles on housing, as this area will be decided by the individual republics, Kalmykov continues. The law covers exviction without being given alternative accommodation. The law also covers intellectual property. Only citizens, not organizations, can possess author's rights. Authors can now expect fees if their work is used by film studios. The effective term of these rights has been extended from 25 to 50 years. Inventors' rights, too, can only be possessed by citizens, but enterprises where inventions are made are given special rights to free use of the invention. The range of inventions covered by the law has been extended. In line with world practice, discoveries have been omitted from the law. The validity of foreign laws in this area is specified.

The first reading of this law is passed.

The announcer says the deputies proceeded to discuss the miners' strikes, and condemn strike blackmail, and the program ends.

Resolution on Referendum Results

PM2203102691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Resolution signed by Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov in Moscow on 21 March: "USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Results of the USSR Referendum 17 March 1991"]

[Text] Having examined the USSR Central Electoral Commission announcement of the results of the first referendum in our country's history, on 17 March 1991, on the question of preserving the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign states in which the rights and freedoms of people of all nationalities will be fully guaranteed, the USSR Supreme Soviet notes the high degree of activeness and civic responsibility displayed by the participants in the nationwide vote.

In the country as a whole, according to preliminary figures, 147 million people took part in the referendum. Some 112 million people—that is, 76 percent of those who voted—came out in favor of preserving the USSR. Thus the majority of citizens proceeded from the view that the destiny of the country's peoples is indivisible, and that only by joint efforts can they successfully resolve questions of economic, social, and cultural development. The position of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet on the question of preserving the USSR on the basis of democratic transformations received support.

Although the organs of power in a number of republics (Georgia, Lithuania, Moldova, Latvia, Armenia, and Estonia) did not fulfill the decisions of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet on holding the referendum, violations of citizens' constitutional rights occurred, people were subjected to moral pressure, and the polling places were blockaded, nonetheless more than 2 million citizens of the USSR living in those republics expressed their will and said "yes" to the USSR. The USSR Supreme Soviet assesses this manifestation of civic consciousness as an act of courage and patriotism.

The USSR Supreme Soviet condemns the use of official powers to the detriment of individual rights and the flouting of those rights under the slogans of national sovereignty and democracy.

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. State organs of the USSR and the republics are to be guided in their practical activity by the people's decision, adopted through the referendum, in support of a renewed USSR, proceeding on the basis that this decision is final and binding throughout the USSR's territory.

2. The USSR president, the Federation Council, and the republic Supreme Soviets are recommended, on the basis of the referendum results, to work more vigorously toward completing work on a new Union treaty with a view to signing it as soon as possible. At the same time the drafting of the new USSR Constitution is to be accelerated.

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Supreme Soviet committees, and the standing commissions of the chambers, in the course of the legislative process and monitoring activity, are to pay particular attention to collaborating with the republic supreme soviets and do everything to help improve the functioning of all organs of state power and management.

4. The USSR president, the Federation Council, and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, in view of the concern expressed by the population in the process of the USSR referendum, are to take steps to restore economic ties, the disruption of which is creating difficulties for many enterprises and construction projects and causing a sharp deterioration in the population's supply of food and other goods in daily demand.

The organs of state administration are to ensure effective collaboration among the republics in the interests of the universal strengthening of discipline, organization, and

order, the strict fulfillment of national economic programs, and first and foremost the organized preparation for and implementation of the spring field work in agriculture.

The proposals and observations put forward by USSR people's deputies at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the course of discussing the results of the referendum are to be submitted to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers for consideration. 5. Soviets of people's deputies and all state organs in the localities are to resolutely stop the flouting of citizens' rights regardless of their nationality, to use the full force of the law to prevent the kindling of national enmity and hatred, and to take steps to eliminate violations of citizens' housing rights, labor rights, pension rights, and other rights and freedoms. 6. The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is instructed to present its findings on the compliance with the USSR Constitution and USSR laws of acts adopted in connection with the referendum by the republics' highest organs of state power restricting the rights of USSR citizens.

7. The USSR general prosecutor is to examine, within two months, instances of the violation of citizens' constitutional rights that occurred in the course of holding the USSR referendum, and to report to the USSR Supreme Soviet on the measures adopted. 8. State organs, institutions and organizations, political parties, and other social associations, as well as the mass media, are recommended to take fuller account, in their activity, of the people's will to preserve our union state.

It is deemed necessary to adopt measures to ensure strict compliance with USSR laws, prevent confrontations between Union and republic legislation, and consolidate and rally society along the path of democratic renewal.

[Signed] Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov
Moscow, Kremlin, 21 March 1991

Closed-door Session Continues

LD2103130491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Report from the Kremlin by legislative correspondent Lyudmila Semina]

[Text] The Union legislature will adopt a decision today on the striking miners' demands. Yesterday evening the Supreme Soviet discussed their appeal. A commission headed by Deputy Kucherenko is now preparing a draft decision naming specific measures.

Another important matter is that the deputies have received documents on questions of the reform of retail prices and the social protection of the population. To all appearances, the conversation behind closed doors that took place on Tuesday has not ended. The deputies want complete clarity, if only in the organization of the payment of compensation.

At the morning session, the preliminary results of the referendum were summed up. Orlov, chairman of the central commission for the referendum, reported that in the country as a whole 76 percent of those who voted advocated a renewed Union. The commission assesses this as a success of Soviet democracy. The referendum also highlighted many complicated problems. The deputies assessed the negative results of the vote in Sverdlovsk and Kiev and the unconvincing ones in Moscow and Leningrad as votes not against the Union but against the conditions in which people are living.

As you understand, the debate was keen. Views were diametrically opposed, ranging from those saying that the democrats had lost and that it is time to stop flirting with those, who, I quote, perpetrated these disgraceful things, to proposals to the Union parliament to find a common language with those who opposed the referendum. [no unquote as heard] The primary desire is to resolve the problem of the protection of human rights in our country.

Deputy Dzasokhov reported that those abroad heaved a sigh of relief that a great power—the Soviet Union—remains in the international arena and the leadership's firm course toward continuing the democratic reforms in the country is confirmed.

There is a break in the proceedings now.

Golik Reports Miners' Meeting

LD2103234991 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1909 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Remarks by Deputy Yuriy Vladimirovich Golik at the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 20 March—recorded]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrades: I have not done any preparation work for this speech. Therefore it may be rather chaotic. It is just that the situation is forcing me to voice my view on this matter and not to keep silent. To begin with, here is just one little nuance, a fact adding to what Aleksandr Sergeyenko said here yesterday.

Yesterday Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev indeed met Kuzbass representatives. These were deputies from the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet headed by (Omar Gumirovich Kleyev), chairman of the oblast soviet, who is also chairman of the oblast executive committee. The delegation also included deputies of the Kemerovo City Soviet. No strike committees were involved. Contrary to what was claimed here, Mikhail Sergeyevich did not reject any political claims, for the simple reason that no one advanced any political demands to him in the first place. The conversation lasted two and a half hours, and it was very businesslike and very productive. As a result of a joint effort, five or six questions were worked out, that needed to be resolved as a matter of first priority. About the same number of questions were postponed for later consideration. Yesterday these questions were worked through in the government by Comrade Pavlov,

the prime minister. The same questions were also worked through in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] government. [passage omitted]

Action Taken on Miners' Strike

LD2103192791 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—The Soviet parliament today tried to stop miners' strikes, which have continued for three weeks. Strikes may entail disastrous consequences for the country's economy.

A decision taken by the Soviet legislature instructs the government to examine the situation in the coal industry and draft measures to overcome the drop in coal production. In addition, parliament appealed to miners to abandon political ultimatums.

The strike, which began on March 1, was gradually spreading and now hit a fourth of about 600 mines in various coal-mining areas.

In contrast to the first mass miners' strikes in the summer of 1989, a considerable number of strikers now advanced political demands: a resignation of the Soviet president and the all-Union government and the dissolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

The president flatly refused to conduct any negotiations with those advancing these demands.

At the same time the all-Union leadership, understanding the great danger of continued strikes to the economy, is increasingly displaying readiness to meet miners' economic demands.

On March 14, Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev sent a telegram to the miners of the Kuznetsk coal basin, informing them of additional funds appropriated to finance social programmes in the industry.

Today's decision, which was also compiled by deputies from mining regions, will serve the same purpose. The document shows the will of all-Union authorities to settle miners' problems and contains a promise to adopt a package of legislative acts to reform economic relations in the industry and the country.

At the same time the decision stresses that "the way of political ultimatums in settling economic and social problems is unacceptable and very dangerous."

Despite readiness displayed by the all-Union leadership for a compromise, representatives of many strike committees, above all in the Kuznetsk coal basin in Siberia, continue insisting on the implementation of political rather than economic demands.

Incidentally, they are supported by Russian Parliament President Boris Yeltsin and representatives of the "Democratic Russia" movement.

After the president's refusal to meet representatives of strike committees demanding his resignation, four members of strike committees and Deputy of the Russian parliament Bella Denisenko declared an indefinite hunger strike in support of miners' political demands.

At the initiative of the "Democratic Russia" movement, pickets were stationed in Moscow in their support and to collect donations.

Despite the fact that miners are in a state of confrontation with workers in related industries—railwaymen, steelmen, power industry workers who are suffering losses from the strike—it seems that strikers are determined to continue the job action.

The next few days will show how parliament's decision will tell on their determination.

Ban on 28 Mar Protest Urged

LD2103190691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1817 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Mar (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet today adopted a decree proposing that the Moscow City Soviet ban the mass demonstrations [manifestatsiya] planned to be held in the Soviet capital on 28 March. The "Democratic Russia" movement has already requested permission to hold demonstrations. It is planning to once again assemble up to 500,000 people in Manezhnaya Square in the center of the city, just as it did on 10 March, and other organizations and groups of citizens are expected to join.

This time the demonstration is scheduled to coincide with the 28 March opening of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies. The session has been called on the initiative of the "Communists of Russia" legislative faction, requesting the resignation of Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian legislature.

The USSR Supreme Soviet states in its decree that the holding of the demonstration on a working day would create "considerable obstacles in guaranteeing the necessary public order and safety for citizens and in guaranteeing normal working conditions for the capital's establishments, enterprises, and transportation, and it would infringe on the rights and interests of a large number of citizens."

In an address to the deputies, Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister, emphasized that the simultaneous holding of meetings of many thousands of people in Moscow "creates an explosive situation with unforeseeable consequences." He emphasized: "It is not

only a matter of tension in society, it is also a threat to people's lives." Vitaliy Doguzhiyev added that an appeal from Russian people's deputies has been addressed to the USSR president and the country's prime minister, requesting that they "guarantee their personal security and eliminate incidents of pressure, threats, and blackmail."

In the decree adopted today by the Union legislature, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies have been charged with "taking the necessary measures to guarantee reliable public order and the safety of citizens, including USSR people's deputies and republics' people's deputies."

Explanation Demanded for Journalists' Dismissal

LD2103184791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian

[Report on the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 21 March; from the "Legislative Diary" program]

[Text] Before discussing a draft decision on the results of the referendum, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov read out a question from two deputies, Ryabchenko and Shcherbak, addressed to USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union Television and Radio Broadcasting Company:

[Begin Lukyanov recording] It has become known from the press that the popular television journalists Mitkova, Rostov, and Kiselev have by your decision, been dismissed from work on the Television News Service program. We regard this as a ban on the profession for political reasons and as a stifling of glasnost by Central Television. We ask you to inform the Supreme Soviet about the reasons for and the juridical justification for such actions. We regard the instilling on state television of the personal views of a particular manager and the position of just one of the many political parties and the limitation of this regard of the freedom of information as inadmissible.

[Signed] Ryabchenko and Shcherbak.

This is on an absolutely specific issue. You could discuss this matter and accept it as a parliamentary question, or decide not to do so, but you ... [interrupted by indistinct unidentified deputies]

So, we have agreed simply to hand it on to Comrade Kravchenko, have we? [end recording]

Deputy Says Moscow Should Be Capital District

LD2103122191 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—Moscow should become the capital district, believes deputy of Soviet parliament Aleksandr Krayko, member of the commission to draft a law on the status of the capital of the USSR and of the Russian Federation. The commission was formed by the Soviet president.

In an interview published by the newspaper GLASNOST today, Krayko emphasised that "the capital district should exist in accordance with laws aimed to ensure that while discharging its functions Moscow should not exert special influence on state affairs." He said he was convinced this was in the interests of the entire country.

"We have no right to repeat the mistake of the French Revolution where the power in the capital turned out to become the power in the whole country," the deputy said. "According to the concept of current chairman of the Moscow Council, Gavriil Popov, the mayor of Moscow should be vested in dictatorial powers, one might say. He alone appoints officials, while the Moscow Council plays the kind of role similar to that of the British queen at parliament. His first deputy Sergey Stankevich believes that the mayor should necessarily be included in the USSR Security Council," the deputy said.

Asked how he visualises the capital district, Krayko said that, to begin with, it should be formed within the present boundaries of Moscow to be later spread to the near areas of the Moscow region.

Regarding the activity of the commission to draft the law on the capital's status, the deputy said that it outsteps the time limit. This is largely due to the fact that the Moscow Council had not submitted its proposals on time.

Youth Paper Apologizes to Lukyanov

PM2003145191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 91 p 4

[Unattributed "Correction"]

[Text] S. Stupar's note in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 March entitled "Does Stankevich Live in Kosygin's Apartment?"—obtained from the Moscow City Soviet Press Center—pointed out that [USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman] A.I. Lukyanov had produced a resolution on a telegram citing false information about [Moscow City Soviet Deputy Chairman] S. Stankevich. This was wrong. The author of the resolution was Deputy M.I. Surkov, member of the commission for privileges. Otherwise the facts cited in the article are correct.

We apologize to A.I. Lukyanov.

Political & Social

First Secretary Summarizes Moscow Results

LD2103171491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1348 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent Tatyana Feoktistova on news conference held by Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, in Moscow on 21 March]

[Text] Yuriy Prokofyev, head of the Moscow CPSU organization, today summed up the results of the referendum on the future of the country. Our correspondent Tatyana Feoktistova reports:

[Feoktistova] The results of the referendum—the news conference with Yuriy Prokofyev was devoted to this. It was held today at the Moscow City Committee [MGK] of the CPSU. Concerning the question of the Russian presidency, the first secretary of the MGK admitted that active propaganda on the introduction of this post had not been done by the Moscow gorkom [city party committee]. Yuriy Prokofyev explained this as not due to the deliberate position of the gorkom, but allegedly because it was not quite clear to them what powers the president of Russia would have. But as the majority voted for the new presidential post, these powers will be examined taking into account the provisions on this in the law on the referendum. Here is the opinion of the first secretary of the MGK on some other questions of great interest.

[Begin recording] [Feoktistova] Who, in your opinion, is the most worthy to occupy the post of Russian president?

[Prokofyev] If the president is elected it is necessary to know initially what powers he should have, and whether he is controlled. I am against authoritarian, uncontrolled power. If the president is controlled by the soviet, say, by the legislature—whatever it is called in our country—then I could support such a form. If it is not a controlled leader of the country, then I will oppose it. But as to a candidate for a possible president of Russia, I have my viewpoint, and there is a candidate, but I do not want to name it. I am sorry.

[Feoktistova] What is your attitude to the National Salvation Committee, and the Russian Committee in particular?

[Prokofyev] On my word of honor, I did not know such a thing existed. If the Russian Committee is what Voronin and those with him were talking about—I think in Slavyanskiy Bazar [Moscow restaurant]—I believe it is quite simply not serious. In principle I do believe our country requires a National Salvation Committee. I think we can solve the problems in a democratic way, with the help of democratic bodies that have been elected in our country.

[Feoktistova] There was a bigger percentage of yes voters in the villages and hamlets than in the big towns, where the party organizations are both strong and generally authoritative. How can you explain this paradox?

[Prokofyev] In rural areas, on the whole, the standard of living has not changed as sharply as in the big towns. Then overall, the rural population is more stable and less emotional, and perhaps more rational, than our townsfolk. So it would be more difficult for political organizations in big towns. That is an objective condition. I consider myself a democrat. The only ones to lose were those who called for the ruin of the country, and they realized the consequences that could follow the ruin of such a state, both for you and me, and for the world community. [end recording]

[Feoktistova] There were many paradoxes to be acknowledged at the referendum itself: there was rigging and foisting leaflets and open propaganda on people on the day of the referendum, and even dead souls voting. But nothing was said of that. Is it worth recalling now that Chapter 3, Article 16 of the law on the referendum was openly violated? The victors here are not judged.

Lukyanov Considers Referendum's Importance

LD2103210391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov by correspondent Igor Fesunenko on the all-Union referendum in Moscow on 21 March; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] This is the first time that the country has used this democratic instrument to establish what the view of the public is. In general, the wishes of the majority of the people on this most important question in the life of the country, this historic question in the life of the country, the preservation of a renewed USSR as a renewed federation of equal and sovereign republics in which every citizen will enjoy the full range of their rights, freedoms, and powers, have been revealed unambiguously and completely. It has to be said that the majority of the people, the majority of those who participated in the referendum, supported the union, preserving the union.

This is the main conclusion, and it is a very important conclusion because one has to bear in mind that this referendum was held at a very difficult and very complex time, a time of great social tension, a time of disruption in economic ties—the disruption of economic ties between enterprises—a time of universal shortages and empty shelves, a time, I would say, of very great exacerbation in interethnic relations. In this atmosphere, the people, the majority of the citizens of the USSR, have made their views unequivocally clear. This is exceptionally important.

It is also important that those people who are fond of speaking in the name of the people, as a whole, will now find things to be more difficult. The wishes of the majority of the population are clear. Now, these wishes

must be adhered to, implemented, and realized. Furthermore, it seems to me—and this is important, too—it is not only the idea of preserving the Union that has been supported; it is not only our federation that is being renewed, that has been supported; the line that was pursued by the country's leadership has also been supported.

Of course, there were forces that wanted to link the results of the referendum to one personality or other, to one policy or other. Their motives were not totally altruistic, let's say. The line expressed by the Congress of People's Deputies has been supported in principle. You no doubt remember that at the congress 1,700 deputies expressed support for this wording, for the submission of this question to referendum; only 20 were against. What is more, one must say that the support expressed for this line is also support for the line of the Supreme Soviet, and to be blunt, the line of the president.

Finally, I consider it most important that an answer has been given in relation to international affairs. Now, a mighty state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—not small principalities—faces the world. The policy, the same renewed policy that was carried out before in international affairs, will continue.

[Fesunenko] Could you confirm this assessment with specific data on the results of the referendum?

[Lukyanov] Specific data? Here is the precise data on the results of the referendum: A total number of 184.2 million people were included in the lists for the referendum; 147.5 million people participated in the referendum. Those who spoke in favor of retaining the union, those who said yes to the union: 112.1 million of Soviet citizens, which is 76.3 percent of the total number of those who participated in the referendum. Those who said no to retaining the union: 32.2 million or 21.8 percent. Ballot that were considered invalid: 2.7 million.

There is a very important thing to note here: These figures refer to the nine republics where the referendum was carried out fully, where central commissions were set up for the referendum. But, in six republics, central commissions were not set up. Here, the voting was conducted within work forces, in areas under the jurisdiction of a number of soviets, and so on. At this point, people might ask what bearing these results have on the entire electorate.

[Fesunenko] On the entire union? On the entire population?

[Lukyanov] On all voters within the union. Let's compare these figures with the total number of eligible voters at the last Union-wide elections. At that time, there were 192 million of them on the electoral roll. If you view the results on this scale, so to speak, if you compare them with this figure, you see that 58.3 percent of our citizens voted for the union.

[Fesunenko] In other words, more than half, whichever way you view it.

[Lukyanov] Yes, I would like to use this opportunity to thank each and every Soviet citizen who participated in the voting, in the referendum, and who said yes to preserving our Union, to its renewal.

[Fesunenko] Anatoliy Ivanovich, both during the election campaign on the eve of the referendum and now that the results are being analyzed, it seems to me some unhealthy and negative elements of psychological warfare are emerging. These have been unleashed by certain forces. The referendum has been portrayed as a struggle between certain parties, between certain politicians. Now, there is talk of losers and winners. Are such ideas correct?

[Lukyanov] I do not think that the referendum can be viewed in terms of losers and winners. The people, the majority of the Soviet people, have expressed their wishes. These wishes are unambiguous. This being so, the following needs to be said about losers, in my view. After all, many of our citizens voted not so much against the union as against their living conditions, against those difficulties they have now found themselves. That is a very important point that needs to be borne in mind.

[Fesunenko] That is clear. The referendum has been held. What happens now? What influence do you think the referendum might have on the future of our country?

[Lukyanov] You know, that is the very question asked by Nikolay Kustarev, a metal worker from Gorkiy who spoke today. What happens next? It seems to me that the most important thing now is to implement these wishes, to bring the decision of the referendum and the actions of state bodies into conformity with each other. It is exceptionally important for the decision of the referendum to be carried out in practice. This means, first and foremost, progress toward the conclusion of the new Union treaty. This progress must be accelerated. At the Supreme Soviet, it has also been mooted that progress toward the adoption of a new constitution, the drafting of a new constitution and its adoption, should be accelerated at the same time.

Second, and this is also exceptionally important, economic ties must be laid on to the maximum degree. We must quickly create a single economic space in the country so that action can be taken to ensure that ties are not disrupted, are not severed between enterprises, regions, and republics. This instruction will be given by the Supreme Soviet to the government and to the president and to the Federation Council.

There is yet another aspect and we had a very serious and considered debate on this. The point is that the Supreme Soviet must also cooperate far more actively with the Supreme Soviets of the republics, and the commissions

and committees must also cooperate so that the development of our democratic institutions proceeds in unison, so that the war of laws, budgets, banks, and ambitions is ended.

This is very important and I would like to say that the closest attention was paid so that the Supreme Soviet, as well as all our law enforcement organs, will ensure the equal rights of the citizens, irrespective of their nationality wherever they are living, throughout the territory of our country. All this will be reflected in the decision of the Supreme Soviet. We will probably finish the work on it today—it is being reviewed now, many suggestions were made—and publish it.

[Fesunenko] You will agree that the referendum itself, especially the whole campaign, has revealed a lot of the shortcomings in the work of our local, as well as the republican authorities and some sensitive points in our social psychology, perhaps our unpreparedness for campaigns of this nature to reveal the nation's will.

[Lukyanov] I think it will generally be an illusion to say that everything went well here. First, we are holding a referendum for the first time and it has revealed a lot of organizational shortcomings and the incompetence in dealing with these processes. On the other hand, a very serious struggle was going on; there were cases of open resistance in some places, of which I have already spoken. On the other hand, the referendum itself, the process of getting in touch with the people, has revealed a lot of the shortcomings that need to be solved immediately. We have decided to do this. The deputies were going out to the localities. They have brought a lot of such material. We want to instruct the government and the local authorities to examine all these suggestions, all the remarks that have been expressed, and make the major shift here, because there was certainly an enormous number of shortcomings. If one is to speak seriously, during preparations for the referendum, I was thinking all the time about this: Our generation is deciding on the problem that has been set by probably 50 generations of the citizens, each of us, 50 generations. We are standing on their shoulders while deciding this very problem of preserving the country. Maybe the most important feeling I get from the results of the referendum—and I think that our deputies feel the same—is this feeling of an enormous responsibility that the Soviet people have felt when they were giving a verdict saying yes to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. I think this attitude toward the motherland, the responsibility for its future, was the most important thing of all that we have seen at the referendum, and what was reflected in its results.

[Fesunenko] Thank you for the interview, Anatoliy Ivanovich.

[Lukyanov] All the best to you.

[Fesunenko] Thank you.

Defense, Other Implications of Union Breakup

PM1903115091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Major M. Zheglov article under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Judgments": "Union or Chaos"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The USSR is at the moment experiencing colossal difficulties in its transition from an administrative edict economy to a market one, and in the transition to a new democratic political system. Many of us are more than disillusioned with the reform process. We have discovered that the way is hard, that it is better not to talk about material gains, and that the disruption is simply unbearable. However, it was hardly possible to expect such sweeping reforms to be carried out without disputes, errors, setbacks, or deviations. We have come up against this now, but in the coming years we will also be hounded by difficulties. But there is, you see, simply no other way out. And the only possible way forward for the Soviet Union is to complete the reform process. But on one condition: that we preserve the Union's integrity. On a different basis, that of a new Union Treaty, but nevertheless as an integrated state.

Of coarse, peoples seeking autonomous statehood have the right to achieve it. Now all the legal means to achieve this exist, without confrontation and chaos. But here you have to display the greatest levelheadedness and caution. You cannot help but see that the secession of republics from the Union does not resolve social and economic problems, but creates a mass of new ones: rifts splitting a large number of mixed families, the resettlement of millions of people, and also disputes due to the artificiality of many of the borders. All this means that when we take a decision about the future of the union state, we should on no account take problems of the moment as our point of departure, even if they are extremely pressing. You should never measure national aspirations in terms of the present generations' material needs. You have to look to the future. And, however strange this may seem, to the past. "Our forebears' opinions should also be taken into consideration in the referendum, as they created and developed our multinational community. It would be a shame if the this catastrophe and we all are guilty, canceled out its memory."

For this reason I adduced this quotation. It does not belong to some representative of the center, on whom the accusations of those who are called democrats have now come crashing down. It is extracted from the "Appeal From Emigres to Our Fellow Countrymen," signed by people who are very far from the notion of socialism: L. Barat—first deputy Don ataman in Western Europe, V. Zarubin—representative of the newspaper NASHA STRANA [OUR COUNTRY] in Germany, and O. Krasovskiy—chief editor of the journal VECHE [COUNCIL]. Will we also hear their voices among others speaking in favor of the necessity of preserving the Union? Or will emotion prevail over reason?

Let us assume that we will not hear it. You don't need to be Nostradamus to predict that there will be an increase in chaos during the bitter process of dividing everything up: territories, powers, industry, and finally defense potential. As a military man this is closer to me than anything. And so we come to the dividing up of the Army. Or to the creation of national armies. However you want to see it. Along this road a mass of problems arise which await resolution by every new state: from the production line manufacture of military uniforms to the organization of troops' service, recruitment, and military training. And what will happen to the country's air defense system? Will there be many independent systems? How will we divide up our Navy's ships and submarines? In proportion to the size of the population or the territory of each new state formation?

Then the turn of nuclear weapons will come. It is hardly likely that any of the current claimants to power will voluntarily relinquish the status of nuclear power which is dropping into their laps without any particular losses. And so each of the 40, 50, or however many there will be of these mini-states will begin to threaten their use with or without cause. That is, there could be a god-awful nuclear mess. And you only have to take a sober look at the situation developing even today in the relations between several of our republics, to see that such a course of events is possible. And then it will not only be us who will burn in the fire of a nuclear disaster, but the whole of humanity as well.

It is also not possible to ignore the military and political aspects of the Union's disintegration. I am talking about the many treaties on military matters signed by our country only recently. In particular, the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. When it was signed the West proceeded on the basis that the Soviet Union was a unified state with unified armed forces. If in the referendum a "no" vote is returned, the implementation of this treaty is in great doubt for completely obvious reasons. The agreement between the USSR and the United States for a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons may also be left hanging in the air. And finally there are the treaties concluded with Germany. Who will take on the responsibility for the fate of 300,000 of our soldiers and officers, who have to quit its territory by the end of 1994?

Many of those who are for the disintegration of the Soviet Union are looking expectantly to the West, in the hope of getting its assistance. These hopes are not without foundation. The West has already proved that it is ready to help us. And it does so, to our shame. But in the euphoria of the rapprochement with it, we should still not forget about those in the West whose practical aims and interests do not coincide with ours.

It is no accident that the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States has significantly increased its activities with the approach in the USSR of the referendum on the preservation of the country as a unified federal state. An American coordinating committee for aid to the Ukraine has been created there, with the aim of consolidating nationalist forces. It is not a matter of their cooperating with that republic's government, but of supporting the opposition. The many nationalist groupings which speak from a separatist point of view in favor of overthrowing the Ukraine's present government, have noticeably increased their activities in Canada as well. Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nationalist centers abroad are well up with them also.

The Romanian nationalists also declared their position at the tops of their voices in the run-up to the referendum. Participants in a demonstration organized by the cultural society "Bucharest-Kishinev" passed through the capital's main streets. The slogans of this demonstration alone indicate what its aims were: "No Referendum on Romanian Territory on 17 March!", "Restore Greater Romania—Return to the Old Borders." We can only guess what awaits us if the forces supported by them obtain full power, and to what cataclysmic events this will lead.

Statesmen in the United States and Western Europe are afraid of such a turn of events. You can cite in evidence the pronouncement of U.S. President G. Bush at one of his press conferences: "Today a very complex situation has developed in the Soviet Union. But Gorbachev is the president, as I am the President of my country. And we, of course, will do business with those who are vested with power in the Soviet Union. You cannot undertake 25 different diplomatic initiatives with one country. This is not done..." British Foreign Secretary D. Hurd stated his opinion in an even more definite manner: "No responsible person can wish for the Soviet Union to be thrown into chaos, for its disintegration or a civil war to begin. The Soviet republics' economies are dependent on one another. The peoples are closely linked with each other. Whatever their future status might be, they should live together as neighbors. It is not in the interests of the West to facilitate the disintegration of the Soviet Union."

In the event of "x" number of republics seceding from the Union, I would really not try to depict this as the end of the world. Provision for this is made by our Constitution. But it should be realized in ways and means stipulated by the laws and not set up as a barely concealed war. And I am deeply convinced that it is necessary first and foremost to preserve the Union and on this very basis to resolve all problems. The referendum is a reason for serious reflection and an opportunity to make your opinion have an effect. In simple "yes" and "no" answers to complex and equivocal questions affecting our lives. Boycotting it is a refusal to take a civic stance and a betrayal of our national interests.

Krasnodar Group Urges Deputy Kalugin's Recall

91UN1102B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Mar 91 p 3

[Article by TASS correspondent V. Zhilyakov: "An Appeal to the Voters of the Kuban"]

[Text] Krasnodar—A voters' action group for the recall of USSR People's Deputy O.D. Kalugin was set up in Mostovskiy Rayon, Krasnodar Kray. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA KUBAN published an appeal from this group to all voters of the Kuban. It expressed their lack of confidence in Kalugin, and included a demand to immediately recall him as USSR people's deputy.

The appeal said that they could no longer tolerate O.D. Kalugin's use of deputy credentials against their interests, in order to break up the Union and divide its people. His actions run counter to a number of resolutions adopted by the kray Soviet of People's Deputies, including those to temporarily restrict the issuance of residence permits in the kray and a firm position on the supply of foodstuffs for the populace.

Kalugin became a co-founder of the committee for the public trial of the CPSU which was recently registered in Moscow. The document stresses that his participation in this committee is considered to be nothing but an affront to the memory of millions of communists who sacrificed their lives for the freedom and independence of the Motherland, and to those who reinforced the economic might of the Motherland by honest labor. On behalf of all voters, we ask his collaborators in splitting the CPSU to place on the agenda of the committee, as soon as possible, the issue of holding Kalugin responsible for the actions he committed to the detriment of the USSR as a former communist and KGB officer who spent more than 30 years walking on the glorious path to his general's star with a party membership card in his pocket.

The appeal says that they interpret Kalugin's anti-people efforts, which foster malevolence and are contrary to their objectives, as his striving to settle personal scores, to avenge his demotion and the cancellation of his general's retirement pay. This does not become a member of parliament. We did not put our trust in Kalugin for such actions, and we believe that they are incompatible with the title of our representative—USSR people's deputy.

The appeal is signed by the members of the action group. Let us note that the newspaper has also published materials urging the recall of Kalugin from the body of deputies before. However, as a rule, these have been letters from readers.

KGB Budget, Structure Examined

PM2003143091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 10, 10-17 Mar 91 p 11

[Article by Yevgeniya Albats and Natalya Gevorkyan: "The KGB We Don't Know; Structure And Functions"—first four paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] A lot has been written about the KGB, mostly critical. But none of the writings presents a comprehensive picture of the KGB, the Russian abbreviation for the Committee for State Security, as it is today: structure, functions, interests, and the role it plays in today's Soviet society. Yet such information is vital on the eve of the adoption of a law on the KGB. What good is it if we know next to nothing about the service itself?

For this analysis we used both articles printed in millions of copies in the West, yet unknown to the general Soviet readership, and our own sources.

At one time MN [MOSCOW NEWS] launched an investigation into the Katyn WWII tragedy in the very same manner: The first article, based on foreign sources, grew into an indepth study which then helped obliterate one more blind spot in Soviet history.

We apologize for possible inaccuracies and the omission of some names we were unable to verify. The editorial office is ready to print the KGB's reaction to this article and would be grateful for any help, suggestion or correction that they may offer.

The KGB, descendant of the Cheka (Extraordinary Commission), the GPU (Main Political Department), the NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs), and the MGB (Ministry of State Security), was established by a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on March 13, 1954. The document did not specify the tasks or functions of the service.

Numeric strength

"The KGB"s numeric strength is still a secret. Yet it's not our secret, it's the Supreme Soviet's." **Maj.-Gen. Aleksandr Karbainov, chief of the KGB's PR Centre).**

"On the KGB's numbers: there are more members in the party organization of the KGB's HQ than employees in the CIA and the FBI put together, who number 36,000 **(Oleg Kalugin, former KGB General and now USSR people's deputy).**

"There are 65,000 KGB officers in Moscow alone." **(Oleg Gordiyevskiy, former intelligence officer recruited by Britain's SIS, in an interview given to MN writer Natalya Gevorkyan in New York).**

"By the time Gorbachev became General Secretary the KGB was a mammoth empire, numbering some 400,000 officers inside the country, 200,000 border troops and a wide network of informers." **(Christopher Andrew and Oleg Gordiyevskiy, in their book "KGB: the Inside Story: 1990.) "Open-source Western estimates of KGB manpower have ranged from 490,000 in 1973 to 700,000 in 1986." (Amy W. Knight, in her book "The KGB: Police and Politics in the Soviet Union", 1988.)**

Budget

According to Karbainov, the latest USSR Supreme Soviet session announced the KGB's budget as officially standing at 4.9 billion roubles, including the upkeep of the border troops. For the sake of comparison, Karbainov cited budget figures for the US secret services, including the CIA, the FBI and the army intelligence service—32 billion dollars in all.

The authors did simple computations, dividing 4.9 billion roubles by 400,000 men (the minimum Western estimate for KGB manpower, not counting the 200,000 border troops), to obtain an annual per capita figure of 12,250 roubles. This figure may suffice to cover personnel expenses—wages and costs of uniforms, etc.—but it is not clear where the money spent on development and production of costly specialized technologies comes from. Nor is it clear whether the official figure includes wages paid to KGB officers on the payroll of various other state organizations.

Control

The KGB is subordinated, according to its PR Centre, to the President and the USSR Supreme Soviet, in particular, its Committee for Defense and State Security. Financially, the KGB depends on the USSR Ministry of Finance.

Since 1954 the KGB has seen six chairmen come and go. Vladimir Kryuchkov is its seventh.

Structure

The KGB's think tank is the **1st Directorate (Foreign Intelligence),** headed by Leonid Shevarshin. Andrew and Gordiyevskiy place its mid-80s strength at 12,000

The Directorate is subdivided into regional groups - USA and Canada, Latin America, Benelux countries, English-speaking Africa, etc., and functional groups.
"K" - foreign counter-intelligence (defence against foreign intelligence penetration and control over Soviet citizens abroad);
"T" - scientific and industrial espionage;
"S" - illegals;
"I" - computing technologies;
"A" - foreign disinformation dubbed by some sources as "active operations". This group, in particular, made its business foreign peace movements. It used to (and maybe still does?) produce all sorts of information lies designed primarily for the Third World (like the claim that the AIDS virus is a result of American Experiments in the field of biological weaponry);
"R" - planning and analysis;
"RT" - intelligence operations inside the USSR;
"OT" - logistics; and information - analysis and assessment of intelligence data, including the compilation of daily reports for the country's leaders.

Until 1971, the 1st Directorate had a group code-named "V", whose function was to prepare and carry out acts of terrorism. Works of fiction usually referred to it as the "assassination department". Following the assassination of Stepan Bandera in October 1959 and the arrest of his murderer Stashinskiy a member of the group, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo was reported by Western sources to have prohibited such activities by the KGB, except in "special cases". One such "special case" was the assassination of the Afghan leader Amin in 1979, which, Andrew and Gordiyevskiy claim, was perpetrated by officers of the 8th Department code-named "S", the current (? - ed.) replacement of the "V" group. There is reason to believe that following the operation, seven men were awarded Gold Stars of the Hero of the Soviet Union, some of them posthumously.

The 1st Directorate runs a training centre, an information centere and a research centre to develop and introduce electronic computing technologies.

The 2nd Directorate is in charge of internal security and computer-intelligence. Its chief is Gennadiy Titov. John Barron, an authority on the KGB believes that six out of the twelve groups of the Directorate control foreign diplomats and their contacts with Soviet citizens, and the rest are in charge of foreign tourists and students. Barron's belief may be outdated, though, because it was formulated during the "pre-perestroika era". According to Viktor Glushko, former chief of the Directorate and now First Vice-Chairman of the KGB, the counter-intelligence directorate is actively involved in the domestic effort against organized crime and economic sabotage.

The 3rd Directorate, headed by a man named Sergeyev, is military counter-intelligence. Barron mentions twelve main groups called Special Departments (the Russian abbreviation is 00) inside the Directorate, in charge of the Defence Ministry, the General Staff, the GRU (Main Intelligence Agency), the Army, Navy, Air Force, internal troops, and nuclear weapons. Amy Knight writes: "One former 00 officer, Aleksey Myagkov, who served in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany from 1969 to 1974, offered some figures on the Special Department there: ... about 8,500 officres."

The 4th Directorate, headed by a certain Storozhev, is in charge of counter-intelligence for transport and communications.

The Constitution Protection Directorate, the former 5th, concerns itself with ideology. Its chief is Valeriy Vorotnikov. Available data suggests that the Directorate has a group in charge of unofficial public organizations, including the church. Another sphere of interest is culture, sports, strike committees, and separatist (i.e., nationalist) movements. There is also a special group of Zionism.

The 6th Directorate is economic counter-intelligence and industrial security. Its chief is named Savenkov. One source claims that this Directorate has officers "at all enterprises, with the possible exception of factories producing confectionery and toys".

The Operational Technical Directorate whose Russian abbreviation is OTU, incorporates a wide spectrum of laboratories and research institutions, dealing with matters from eavesdropping techniques to poisons (the Western press places the latter in the 12th laboratory of the Directorate). A person by the name of Demin heads the OTU. Gordiyevskiy told MN that the Directorate produces "perfect IDs and passports. Approximately in

1971 they reached top form when they started producing US passports, whose paper has special composition".

The 7th Directorate is one of the KGB's most vital structures, headed by an Andreyev. Amy Knight writes that practicaly all directorates and departments of the KGB employ its services, since it is in charge of communications and cryptography. Some sources indicate that all cryptographic services, including those of the Foreign Ministry, the government and the President himself (correspondence included), are controlled by the KGB, even if the officers of the directorate are on the payroll of other organizations and departments.

The Protection Service formerly the 9th Directorate, whose chief is a Plekhanov, formerly the chief of the 12th Department (Eavesdropping), supplies guards for the President and other top people.

The 10th Department (Archives) may well contain the real, yet unknown to all but a select few, history of the Soviet state.

The 11th Department coordinates KGB moves with the security services of the socialist countries. Following the well-known recent events in Eastern Europe, its functions and tasks are now rather vague. The latest Western indication is that a large part of the archives of the former socialist countries' security services has been moved to Moscow. The department was subordinated to both the 1st Directorate and the KGB top officials.

The 12th Department eavesdrops on apartments, telephones and offices. There seems to be some grounds to the opinion that all chiefs of this department have always been close to the top KGB men and eventually made first deputies. This department employes thousands of people, especially women, in Moscow alone.

The 15th Directorate builds and maintains specialized government installations for protection of the country's top crust. KGB officers call employees of this Directorate "bunker people". They are in charge of protecting the government and all offices in the eventuality of nuclear war. One of their installations, which looks like a giant vacant lot, can be seen in Moscow between Michurinskiy and Vernadskiy prospekts. The bunker was built under the supervision of Chebrikov, for which he was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour.

The 16th Directorate is in charge of communications interception and sigint. The book by Andrew and Gordiyevskiy claims that this Directorate is always growing. It employs quite a few laureates of the Lenin and State Prizes, mostly mathematicians. Apart from its premises on Dzhevzhinskiy Square, it occupies a large computer centre in central Moscow and a large research centre in one of the city's newer boroughs. The above authors say that the Directorate maintains a network of electronic reconnaissance stations on the premises of Soviet diplomatic and trade missions in over 60 countries of the world. The Directorate operates in close contact with the Main Intelligence Agency of the USSR Defence Ministry. But while the MIA concentrates on military intelligence gathering, the "electronic ears" of the 16th Directorate are tuned to signals of an economic and diplomatic character.

The KGB system includes the border troops, Investigation Department, and government communications group—HF, the "Kremlin line", etc. It runs a network of educational establishments, from the Higher School in southwest Moscow to one- or two-year schools in various cities—Sverdlovsk, Tbilisi, Novosibirsk, Minsk, Orel, Leningrad, as well as Moscow. William Garner of the **Sunday Times Magazine** writes: Some 150,000 graduates of the KGB's educational establishments are estimated to have been actively involved in intelligence-gathering. But the figure may only be half that many, because such assessments are always inaccurate.

Control Commission's Activity Described

PM2103142991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by I. Podsvirov and V. Usanov: "Purge Continues"]

[Text] A.I. Berezin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and former first secretary of the Mordovian CPSU Obkom [oblast committee], has been expelled from the party. This is the first time in the activity of the CPSU Central Control Commission that a party leader of such high rank has incurred such a penalty within its walls.

According to the provision on the Central Control Commission approved by the 28th party congress, it is subordinate only to the CPSU congress and conference and is independent in the decisions it takes. The supreme control organ has the right to demand explanations and to take to task any Communist who by his actions undermines the party's prestige and honor. Recently this rule was also implemented through the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium bureau during the discussion of the question "of the results of the examination of the letters of Comrade M.V. Barinov from the Mordovian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]." There was a strict and exacting talk at the session about A.I. Berezin's personal responsibility.

How was he to blame? If readers remember PRAVDA tried to find an answer to this previously in its items entitled "Black Conscience with a Red Ticket" (17 October 1990) and "Denial of 'Black Conscience'" (5 November 1990). The situation which had taken shape was frequently discussed by the Mordovian Communists—at meetings and party conferences, including an obkom plenum on the results of a check carried out by the CPSU Central Control Commission. In brief, the sensational "case" has its history. For the so-called democrats it sometimes serves as a battering ram in their indiscriminate accusations against the Communists

while the leaders guilty of violations on the contrary try to describe criticism leveled at them as "party cannibalism."

Having lost a sense of party principledness, A.I. Berezin kept compromised communist leaders from being taken to task. Various abuses and the suppression of criticism did not meet with a proper assessment in the republic. Violations were also revealed in the allocation of housing and automobiles for personal use, in the construction of garages, and so forth. M.V. Barinov, a nonparty person, reporting a number of negative facts in letters to the CPSU Central Committee, asked for their authenticity to be verified. Instead of an objective investigation the author of the appeals was, with the obkom's consent, subjected to persecution by individual officials in the republic.

Unfortunately, the Central Control Commission Presidium bureau members noted, the republic's Communists failed to give a prompt party assessment of A.I. Berezin's serious shortcomings in work with cadres. It is true that subsequently the 29th Mordovian republican organization conference resolved to request that the CPSU Central Committee remove him from the Central Committee. Anatoliy Ivanovich would seem finally to be aware of his own guilt. Alas, that did not happen. He was repeatedly invited to a session of the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium Bureau to decide the question of party responsibility and to put an end to a protracted story. For various reasons he refused. Nor did A.I. Berezin appear at this session. In this connection the bureau members asked: Perhaps he does not have the courage to answer for what he did?

Moreover, during the discussion it emerged that A.I. Berezin had lost contact with his primary party organization and did not attend party meetings.

And here is the sorry but natural result: "For the persecution of Comrade M.V. Barinov, the author of letters to the CPSU Central Committee, for gross violations of the party principles of work with cadres and of the norms of party morality, and for his personal lack of discipline displayed during the examination of a personal, Comrade A.I. Berezin is expelled from the CPSU."

Was the measure not too harsh? After all he had indeed done quite a lot for the republic's socioeconomic development. Before submitting their decision the session participants weighed all the pros and cons, as the saying goes. And they reached the firm conviction that no, a punishment of this kind is entirely merited by those who by their actions have damaged the CPSU's prestige. As we can see in our party, despite the complexity of the present political situation, the purge process is continuing. In this lies the Communists' strength and the guarantee of the consolidation of their ranks on a principled basis.

"We should not be afraid to tell people we recognize their mistakes," Ye.N. Makhov, acting chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission, stressed at the session. "At the same time as the inevitable purge of the party the Central Control Commission is returning their good name to the Communists who suffered from persecutions and undeserved punishment."

Let us cite several facts. Thus, in September 1980 Sochi prosecutor P.K. Kostyuk was expelled from the party "for the poor standard of oversight by the prosecutor's office in criminal cases." In actual fact his entire "guilt" consisted in the fact that, in assisting the USSR Prosecutor's Office in investigating the cases of responsible workers in Sochi City involved in bribery and in authorizing their arrest, he had "failed to get on with" S.F. Medunov, then first secretary of the Krasnodar Kray Committee.

The same fate befell I.P. Sharapov, expelled from the CPSU in 1968 solely because in his letters, including some to well known Soviet writers, he had objected to the varnishing of reality by the press and literature and spoke of the reasons for the poor level of efficiency of the work of the state apparatus and other negative phenomena in the country's life. In 1971 the scientist B.N. Tardov was deprived of his party card... for creating a scientific forecasting association without the permission of the relevant organs. He was accused of adventurism and deception. But, as was subsequently confirmed, many of his forecasts (for instance, with regard to the ecological disaster of the Aral Sea) were of great state importance.

The comrades listed above have been restored to the party. This noble work will continue. Thus the return to health of the CPSU ranks is proceeding not only through purging but also through rehabilitation. The story of A.I. Berezin in a certain way is special. By its decision the Central Control Commission Presidium Bureau confirmed its intention to continue to wage the struggle to assert moral principles in life—irrespective of post held, knowledge, and previous services. Nonetheless such "noisy" cases are no longer typical. Principled, honest Communists have come and are continuing to come to the party leadership.

The session took into consideration that the question of the party responsibility of other CPSU members guilty of suppressing criticism will be examined by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium. A statement from V.A. Skoptsov, first secretary of the Mordovian Republican Committee, to the effect that the republican party committee has drawn the appropriate conclusions from the results of the CPSU Central Control Commission check has also been taken into consideration.

Politicians' Popularity Poll Published

PM1903145391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Union Edition p 7

[Aleksey Levinson report under the "Rating" rubric: "Whom Do We Trust"]

[Text] At the very end of 1990 the All-Union Center for Public Opinion Research conducted a poll of 4,600 people who represent the main sociodemographic groups of the USSR population. Among other questions, the degree of trust in several political and social figures was clarified.

The names of 22 such figures who, according to previous polls in 1990, figured among those most well-known to the whole population of the country were entered into a list. At the same time, the names of the most popular figures—Gorbachev and Yeltsin—were deliberately not included in this list.

So, the top 10 persons named by the largest number of people in answer to the question "Which of the following political figures inspires in you the most trust?" were as follows:

(The figures are quoted in percentages of the total number of respondents)

A.A. Sobchak	23
E.A. Shevardnadze	20
A.I. Solzhenitsyn	18
G.A. Yavlinskiy	9
I.S. Silayev	8
N.I. Travkin	8
S.S. Shatalin	7
R.I. Khasbulatov	6
A.I. Lukyanov	6
G.V. Starovoytova	6
L.I. Abalkin	6

There follows a list in decreasing order of figures who registered between 5 percent and 0.5 percent of respondents:
G.Kh. Popov, V.V Bakatin, S.B. Stankevich, Ye.M. Primakov, Yu.N. Afanasyev, T.I. Koryagina, V.N. Lopatin, I.K. Polozkov, I.I. Zaslavskiy, Yu.Yu. Bodyrev, Yu.A. Prokofyev.

Since the list was necessarily limited to 22 names and could not be exhaustive, the respondents were offered the choice after answering this question of indicating themselves which other political figures of the Soviet Union they would like to note among those who inspire their trust.

Four percent of participants in the poll made such additions, but all the names which follow in decreasing order were submitted by less than 1 percent of respondents. They cited the following names:
Gdlyan, Gromov, Kalugin, Nishanov, Ivanov, Obolenskiy, Bocharov, Shakhray, Yakovlev.

This was the distribution of opinion of inhabitants of the USSR at the end of last year. The events of the current year are bound, of course, to have amended this picture one way or another. The All-Union Center of Public Opinion Research intends to carry out further research and inform the public about its results.

DPA Cites Interfax on Damage to Stalin Statue

LD1803155191 Hamburg DPA in German 1509 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—The bust of Josef Stalin at the grave of the Soviet dictator in Red Square, Moscow, has been damaged. The Soviet news agency Interfax reported today that yesterday a homeless and unemployed man had struck the Stalin bust with a steel bar. The bust is between the Lenin Mausoleum and the Kremlin Wall. As a result, the "father of peoples," as the dictator had himself named, is without a nose.

Interfax further reports that the man was detained, and investigative proceedings have begun.

Paper Satirizes Authorities Response

PM2003153191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 91 p 1

[A. Kosulnikov report: "A Piece Lopped Off Stalin"]

[Text] A minor named P., so the INTERFAX agency reports, lopped off the legendary nose of Iosif Vissarionovich Stalin 17 March in broad daylight with several blows of an iron bar. To be more exact, he slightly damaged the bust on his grave by the Kremlin wall.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA will report on the progress of the investigation in the near future. For the time being, however, it is no sin to note that people with criminal intent are sneaking ever closer to the Kremlin. Last week, for example, the V.I. Lenin mausoleum was attacked with a Pepsi bottle, and now a memorial sited behind the mausoleum has been assaulted. This is to say that the deed of Matthias Rust evidently lives on in Soviet people's hearts.

Your correspondent tried to find out which official had failed to spot the perpetrator of the sacrilege. He met with little success. Valentin Kirsanov, chief of the Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] Internal Affairs Main Administration Department for Preserving Order on Red Square, stated that the area behind the mausoleum is overseen by the Kremlin Commandant's department. Kremlin Commandant Gennadiy Bashkin informed us that the Leninskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration is conducting the investigation. The Leninskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration is indeed conducting the investigation, but only because the Kremlin is located on the territory of this rayon of the capital. Remembering an amateur pilot's trouble-free flight from the Federal Republic of Germany, we decided not to turn to the air defense specialists. And so the question of who is to blame for the best friend of physical culture practitioners [Stalin] being left without a nose is still up in the air.

Building of Edifices Criticized

PM1903140591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[V. Kozhemaykov "Response": "Everyone, or Do We Use the Selective Approach?"]

[Text] ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA political observer Igor Korolkov devoted his latest article in the 13 March issue to criticizing the excesses permitted in the past in the construction of hotel and CPSU obkom [oblast party committee] buildings. The writer spares no words to describe the pictures that disturbed him as graphically as possible. He also uses expressive epithets for this, along with apt metaphors and figurative comparisons.

"I recall," he writes, "being struck by the grand five- or six-story party obkom building in Guryev, an old, filthy, poverty-stricken city where houses are corroded by the salt marshes. Imagine: All around you have shacks, worn-out roads, and dust, and in the middle of all this—a fine white building with parquet flooring, carpeting, air-conditioning, and fast elevators... Take the white-stone CPSU obkom palace in Samara. It stands on a hill 'facing' the Volga. It looks very handsome. Loads of money was squandered on it."

What can I say? What happened happened. Many people did indeed lose their sense of proportion when erecting buildings of this kind. Of course, the article's writer was right in naming the Guryev and Samara obkoms and the Volgograd and Perm houses of political enlightenment.

I was only surprised by one thing: Why was there not even a mention in the article of a building which I think all the country's obkoms acknowledge to hold the record in terms of grandeur and luxury? I am referring to the Sverdlovsk Party Obkom. It's no joke: 24 stories! What about the five- or six-story structure in Guryev then?. I can, as it were, imagine the ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA observer's ready pen letting rip in describing the beauties of this skyscraper: Its marble, granite, Finnish equipment, and view over the Ural river Iset.

But no, he did not take advantage of such a brilliant opportunity. Why not? Could it be because the aforementioned skyscraper was put up when Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was obkom first secretary? His idea, his plan, his incarnation. And... it is not appropriate for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's publication to criticize Boris Nikolayevich either for the past or the present—he is only to be praised.

Further: The writer urges everyone who had anything to do with the excesses in party construction "not to maintain their belief." Here is what he writes: "We must put our trust in those people who have no primeval links with the party-administrative system. Those people who have not compromised themselves by years of falsehood." A good intention! What about Boris Nikolayevich then? Or will we not call everyone to account, but take a selective approach?

Correction to Officials' Meeting With Gorbachev

LD2003132491

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Bakatin, Tuleyev on Meeting With Gorbachev published in the 20 March 1991 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 17: Column one, last paragraph, sentence three make read... Constitution, and this is certainly impermissible for anyone, even if.... (rephrasing sentence);

Same paragraph, sentence four make read... Therefore, these demands were rejected unconditionally. It seems to me that the aims here are to introduce some kind of tension, to introduce some kind of chaos. In the final analysis, this is being done at a time when we have enough complications as it is—very many complications. It is aimed at simply paralyzing, in essence, the entire economy, and paralyzing all social life in the bargain. For the sake of what? What kind of aims are they? Does the aim always justify the means? No, it seems to me... (rephrasing for clarity);

Column two, last graf, sentence two make read... at all suit the highly paid miners—these problems and... (rephrasing for clarity);

Column two, last paragraphf, same sentence make read-...all reviewed very specifically and in detail,... (changing "objectively" to "specifically")

Economic

Text of Cabinet Price Reform Resolution

PM2103134391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p p 1-2

[Resolution signed by V. Pavlov, prime minister, and M. Shkabardnya, administrator of affairs: "USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No 105 of 19 March 1991, Moscow, Kremlin: 'On the Reform of Retail Prices and the Social Protection of the Population'"]

[Text] In accordance with the Agreement of the USSR and Republics concerning the pursuit of an overall coordinated prices and incomes policy and in accordance with the USSR President's Decree on questions of the reform of retail prices and the social protection of the population, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolves:

I. In the Sphere of Retail Price Reform

1. A reform of retail prices, including their stage-by-stage liberalization is to be carried out with a view to ensuring that prices of consumer goods and tariffs for services are shaped taking account of the real prime cost

of their production and sale, consumer characteristics, supply and demand ratio, and the establishment of uniform limits throughout the country's entire territory for the growth of the retail prices of the basic goods which determine the population's standard of living.

The change of retail prices and tariffs is to be coordinated with the implementation of compensation measures for the social protection of the population, the raising of wages, grants, pensions, allowances, and other social payments.

2. In accordance with Appendix No 1 [to the Agreement of the USSR and the Republics], uniform maximum limits for the increase of state retail prices for basic consumer goods are to be established for the entire territory of the country.

The republics can fix lower prices for certain goods produced and consumed on their own territory.

3. The USSR State Committee for Prices and the republics' governments are to approve new state retail prices within the scope of their jurisdiction and bring these into effect as of 2 April 1991.

There is to be no increase in existing state retail prices for medicaments and medical goods, coffee, synthetic fabrics and items made from these, footwear made from synthetics, fur articles, knitted garments, hosiery, toys, gasoline, kerosine, electricity, gas, coal, heating fuel and firewood for the use of the population, and also for vodka.

4. For the purpose of resticting the growth of retail prices, the subsidies for meat, dairy, and fish products, medicaments, and certain other socially significant consumer goods are to be partially preserved for the year 1991.

5. It is laid down that in 1991 goods in accordance with Appendix No. 2 [of the Agreement of the USSR and the Republics] will be sold to the population at regulated prices. The regulation of prices is carried out by introducing maximum limits for these prices or scales for their amendment in relation to the listed prices or else in aaccordance with some other procedure determined by the price-formation bodies within the scope of their jurisdiction.

The USSR State Committee for Prices and the republics' price-formation bodies, within the scope of their jurisdiction, are to approve maximum price levels and the scale of adjustments to such prices and inform all enterprises and organizations concerned.

6. In accordance with Appendix No 3 [to the Agreement of the USSR and the Republics] goods are to be included in the list of comsumer goods sold to the population at contract (free) retail prices which has been approved by the USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 1134 of 12 November 1990.

7. In connection with the further liberalization of price formation the establishment of additional payments for new consumer goods with the index "D" or "N" is to be ended.

8. For the purpose of raising the standard of trade services for the population and guaranteeing the equal profitability for the sale of both cheap and expensive goods, the USSR State Committee for Prices in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Trade is to introduce, simultaneously with the new state retail prices, new trade discounts differentiated according to the practicular consumer goods. In so doing, identical scales of discounts are to be established for retail trade enterprises and public catering enterprises.

It is recommended that the republics' governments, where necessary, refine the lists of rayons, organizations, and enterprises for which increased trade discounts are granted when supplying goods according to state retail prices and also to revise the size of surcharges in public catering in connection with the raising of wholesale and retail prices and tariffs, contributions for social insurance, and trade discounts.

The USSR Ministry of Railways and the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet are to establish new surcharges for products and goods sold in dining cars and buffet cars, and public catering enterprises on board ships.

9. The USSR Ministry of Railways, the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation, the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, and the USSR Ministry of Communications are, by agreement with the USSR State Committee for Prices, to approve new tariffs for passenger conveyance by railroad, air, and sea transport, and for communications services.

10. The USSR State Committee for Prices and the republics' administrative bodies are to make sure that all enterprises and organizations concerned are informed of the new retail prices.

The USSR State Committee for Prices, the USSR Ministry of Finance, and the USSR Ministry of Trade are to establish a procedure for the revaluing of goods by the date of the entry into force of the new state retail, regulated, and free prices. Money from the revaluing of goods is deducted into the union budget and into the budgets of the union republics in equal proportions.

11. It is laid down that nonfood consumer goods for which the existing retail prices (after deduction of trade discounts) are lower than the new wholesale prices, are sold by the producer-enterprises to the trading organizations (enterprises) and to other consumers at wholesale prices (with the exception of goods which fall within the compass of the list of those products which are subsidized at the decision of the USSR Government and governments of the republics), and to the population at wholesale prices with trade surcharges on a scale up to 20

percent (for regions of the Far North and equivalent remote and mountainous regions—on a scale up to 30 percent).

12. The goverments of the republics and the USSR state Committee for Prices are to be strictly guided by the general policy in the prices sphere, are to step up monitoring of compliance with the established procedure of price formation, promptly rescind prices formed in contravention of the existing legislation, ensure the inevitability of the application of economic sanctions against enterprises and organizations violating state pricing discipline, and take steps to bring to account persons guilty of such violations.

II. In the Sphere of the Social Protection of the Population in Connection With the Change of Retail Prices

13. When carrying out comprehensive measures for the social protection of the population it is essential to proceed from the unconditional observance of USSR citizens' constitutional rights to labor and to fair remuneration, their equality before the law, and the equal rights of citizens of all republics.

Compensation to the country's population for the additional expenditure entailed by the change in state retail prices is to be paid in accordance with the following basic principles:

the channelling into compensation of all money derived from the increased prices of basic food goods, bulk types of construction materials, and furniture, and also other nonfood goods according to lists defined by the republics, taking into account the income levels of various social strata and groups of the population;

full compensation for the increased price of childrens's goods with the targeted channelling of the corresponding money toward families with children that have not attained their majority;

the establishment of scales of compensatory payments—differentiated according to the social and demographic groups of the population—from the budget and other sources with priority being given to material support for socially vulnerable strata, above all children, young people in education, invalids, pensioners, young families, one-parent [nepolnyye] families, and families with many children;

the raising of wages (labor remuneration) for workers [rabotayushchiye] with the simultaneous reduction of the taxation of profits of enterprises (kolkhozes) and citizens' incomes;

the targeted channelling of part of the money obtained from the increased prices and tariffs toward the additional raising of the level of wages for workers in the leading professions in the sphere of education, health care and social security, culture, and archive establishments;

the raising of existing grants and introduction of new grants for young people in education;

the augmentation of the scale of pay, food, goods, and other forms of material provision for military servicemen;

the increase of the scales of all forms of pensions, allowances, and other social payments, and also the broadening of the range of persons enjoying material support from the state from the USSR Social Insurance Fund and the USSR Pension Fund;

full compensation for increased expenditure on social services to the population in hospitals, boarding schools, schools, homes for the aged and for the disabled, and preschool and other establishments in the social sphere;

the supplementing of monetary compensation to disadvantaged strata of the population by means of various types of social assistance and primarily goods in kind, given by local bodies;

the abolition of zonal [poyasnyy] differentiation of state retail prices for food goods;

the establishment of scales of compensation payments taking account of existing regional coefficients for wages.

It is laid down that:

in accordance with the Agreement of the USSR and the Republics on Questions of the Reform of Retail Prices and the Social Protection of the Population the scale of compensatory sums for the republics, krays, and oblasts are determined on the basis of the population's actual consumption of goods and services from state resources in 1990;

the first payments of compensation to students and pupils, pensioners, children, and other persons receiving social pensions and allowances, are made in advance, before the date when the new prices for consumer goods and services are to be introduced;

the specific scales of and procedure for compensation payments, taking regional conditions and the structure of consumption into consideration are established by the republics' bodies at levels not lower than those indicated in this resolution for the guaranteed scale of increase for incomes of the corresponding groups of the populatiopn with the proviso that new retail prices are introduced on the basis of the levels envisaged by the aforementioned Agreement of the USSR and the Republics and this resolution.

The Procedure for Increasing the Population's Income and Minimum Guaranteed Sizes of Increase

For Working Citizens

14. State enterprises, organizations, and institutions are to carry out a review of the wage rates and salary scales approved by decisions of the USSR Government or of other organs on its instructions.

Wage rates and salaries are to be increased according to the procedure and by the amounts laid down by the enterprise administration by agreement with the trade union committee in the light of the basic compensation principles set out in point 13 of the present resolution and of the decisions of republics' governments but in any case by at least 60 rubles [R] per month.

If necessary, the first payments are to be made in the form of special payments in addition to wages, on a separate payroll [vedomost] and in absolute sums, and these sums are to be subsequently incorporated in wage rates and salaries.

It is recommended that collective and cooperative enterprises and social organizations employing state wage rates and salary scales increase workers' pay in the light of the principles laid down by the present resolution for state enterprises and organizations.

15. Pending the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of legislative acts on establishing a new level of minimum wage, the implementation of a reform of labor remuneration, and the conclusion of pay agreements between enterprise administrations and the trade unions (or other organ empowered by the labor collective) for 1992, the wage rates and salary scales approved by decisions of the USSR Government or other organs on its instructions and increased by R60 in accordance with point 14 of the present resolution are to be regarded as the state guarantees of minimum levels of labor remuneration for specific occupational and skill categories given observance of the working hours laid down by labor legislation and the fulfillment by the working person of his labor duties (labor norm).

16. It is laid down that after increasing wage rates and salaries in accordance with point 14 of the present resolution enterprises independently establish higher wage rates and salary scales for workers and employees while preserving the existing ratios between wage and salary size within categories of personnel, and also determine the types and sizes of increments, additional payments, bonuses, and other incentive payments, including the one-shot long-service award, with the enterprises retaining the funds allocated earlier for these purposes.

The specific size of wages and salaries, and also increments, additional payments, and bonuses for the relevant occupational and skill categories of personnel, is determined at enterprises by the terms of collective contracts (pay agreements).

The above rights are exercised via and within the limits of the funds channeled into labor remuneration in accordance with the USSR laws "On Enterprises in the USSR," "On Taxes on Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations," and "On the Union Budget for 1991." Here the basic labor remuneration fund used to calculate the consumption fund for 1991 is to be increased by the amount of the minimum increase in wage rates and salaries envisaged by point 14 of the present resolution.

Budget-financed enterprises, organizations, and institutions exercise the above rights within the limits of the funds allocated for these purposes.

17. It is laid down that the state guarantees of minimum levels of labor remuneration and the procedure for increasing wage rates and salaries envisaged by the present resolution extend to personnel who are in hired labor relations with enterprises, organizations, and institutions under all forms of ownership.

18. The wages of personnel in leading professions in the spheres of education, health care, social security, culture, and archives establishments are to be increased and brought closer to the level of labor remuneration of personnel in the production sectors.

Advance compensation for the increase in prices is to be paid to personnel of the sectors in question (in just the same way as to personnel of other sectors) in the form of special additions to wage rates and salaries of R60 per month, on a separate payroll.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems is to approve new wage rates and salary scales for the indicated categories of personnel, the intention being to increase them by an average of 60-70 percent (taking into account the measures envisaged by point 14 of the present resolution) in relation to the rates previously established by decisions of the USSR Government or other organs on its instructions.

19. Republics' governments can increase the existing maximum wage (R300) for the payment of coefficients (regional coefficients and coefficients for work in high mountain, desert, or waterless areas) and percentage wage increments for continuous work in northern and eastern regions of the country by the amount of the guaranteed increases in the population's income in connection with the price increases laid down by the republics.

For Families With Children

20. With a view to preserving the living standard of families with children, the existing social allowances for such families are to be increased on average by 60-80 percent, and special compensations are also to be introduced for children aged under 16 years who previously did not receive allowances and for students aged up to 18 years who are not receiving grants.

21. It is deemed advisable to retain the existing procedure for paying social benefits as a percentage of the prescribed minimum wage. Pending the approval of a new level of minimum wage, the following state guarantees of the minimum size of existing allowances for families with children are laid down:

a) R250 for the one-time allowance at the birth of each child;

b) R110 for monthly allowances:

for looking after a child until it reaches the age of 18 months, [payable] to working mothers with one year's length of service (or irrespective of length of service to women below the age of 18 years), and also to mothers who are away from production on full-time training. Where there are two or more children the allowance is paid for each child;

for the children of servicemen on compulsory service;

for children under wardship (guardianship);

for the children of single mothers (widows, widowers) from among former inmates of children's homes (boarding schools);

for children aged up to 16 years infected with HIV or suffering from AIDS;

c) R90 for monthly allowances:

to single mothers with children aged between 6 and 16 years (18 years for students not receiving a grant);

for children aged between 6 and 18 years whose parents are avoiding the payment of maintenance, or in other cases envisaged by legislation where it is impossible to levy maintenance;

d) R80 for monthly allowances:

for looking after a child until it reaches the age of 18 months, [payable] to working women with less than one year's length of service and to nonworking women. Where there are two or more children the allowance is paid for each child;

for children aged between 18 months and 6 years. Here the maximum aggregate income per family member providing entitlement to the allowance is to be doubled, setting it at four times the minimum wage;

to single mothers with children aged up to 6 years;

for children aged up to 6 years whose parents are avoiding the payment of maintenance, or in other cases envisaged by legislation where it is impossible to levy maintenance.

22. Monthly payments are to be established for children who do not receive allowances and pensions under the existing social security system in the sum of R40 for children aged up to 16 years (18 years for students not receiving a grant).

23. Compensation payments to families with underage children are to be introduced in view of the substantial increase in the cost of children's goods, in the following annual amounts:

at least R200 for children aged up to 6 years;

at least R240 for children aged between 6 and 13 years;

at least R280 for children aged between 13 and 18 years.

It is recommended that this compensation be paid in equal quarterly shares.

24. The compensations laid down in points 21, 22, and 23 of the present resolution are to be paid at the mother's main place of work or, if the mother does not work, at the main place of work of the father or the persons in loco parentis. In other cases the compensations are to be paid at social security organs and the place of residence of the parents with the child or of the persons in loco parentis.

The payments laid down in points 22 and 23 of the present resolution are to be made to families with children whose aggregate income per family member does not exceed four times the minimum wage.

The due allowances and compensations are paid at the same time.

Payments are made with monies:

a) from the pension fund:

the monthly allowances for looking after a child until it reaches the age of 18 months and the allowances for children"aged from 18 months to 6 years;

the allowances for the children of servicemen on compulsory service;

the allowances for children aged up to 16 years who are infected with HIV or suffering from AIDS;

b) from the social insurance fund—the one-time allowance at the birth of each child;

c) from the republic budgets:

the monthly child allowances to single mothers (widows, widowers) among the former inmates of children's homes (boarding schools); and to single mothers with children aged between 6 and 16 years (18 years for students not receiving a grant);

the monthly payments for children not receiving allowances and pensions under the existing social security system;

payments to families with underage children in view of the substantial increase in the cost of children's goods;

d) from local budgets—the monthly allowances for children under wardship (guardianship). The payment is to be made by organs of public education.

Allowances for children whose parents are avoiding the payment of maintenance or in other cases envisaged by legislation where it is impossible to levy maintenance are paid with the funds for the payment of temporary allowances for underage children.

For Students

25. By way of compensation for the rise in retail prices, grants for students at higher, secondary specialized, and vocational and technical educational establishments are to be increased, with no change in the absolute level of supplements paid for success in study on top of the grant stipulated under Resolution No. 330 of the USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], and Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee of 7 April 1990.

Grants at higher educational establishments are set as follows:

for successful students, R120 a month; of these, for those with all good assessments, and also those with all good or excellent assessments, R135; and for those with all excellent assessments, R150 rubles a month;

for students who are orphans or have been left without parental care, R160 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also those with all good or excellent assessments, R185; and for those with all excellent assessments, R210 a month;

for students who are orphans or have been left without parental care and who are maintained on state security, R100 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also those with all good or excellent assessments, R115; and for those with all excellent assessments, R130 a month; for students wholly maintained on state security in accordance with USSR Government decisions, R50 a month; of these, for students with all good, and also all good or excellent assessments, R65; and for those with all excellent assessments, R80 a month;
for students who are former servicemen and have become invalids as a result of wounds, shellshock, disablement, or disease sustained in the course of fulfilling their international duty, R180 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R195; and for those with all excellent assessments, R210 a month;
for students in preparatory divisions, R80 a month.

Supplements to grants for students undergoing military training at higher educational establishments under the program for reserve officers are paid on the basis of the level of grants stipulated under Resolution No 330 of the USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee of 7 April 1990.

Grants at secondary specialized educational establishments are set as follows:
for successful students, R100 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R110; and for those with all excellent assessments, R125 a month;
for students who are orphans or have been left without parental care, R160 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R185; and for those with all excellent assessments, R210 a month;
for students who are orphans or have been left without parental care and who are maintained on state security, R80 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also those with all good or excellent assessments, R90; and for those with all excellent assessments, R105 a month;
for students wholly maintained on state security in accordance with USSR Government decisions, R40 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R50; and for those with all excellent assessments, R65 a month;
for students who are former servicemen and have become invalids as a result of wounds, shellshock, disablement, or disease sustained in the course of fulfilling their international duty, R180 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R195; and for those with all excellent assessments, R210 a month.

Grants at vocational and technical educational establishments are set as follows:
for successful students at all types of vocational and technical educational establishments (except for those being trained for work in agricultural production, water resources construction, and forestry) whose study course is not more than 10 months long, R80 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R90; and for those with all excellent assessments, R100 a month; and for students who are the children of servicemen who were killed or of persons categorized on the same footing as Group I and Group II Great Patriotic War invalids, R90 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R100; and for those with all excellent assessments, R110 a month;
for successful students at all types of vocational and technical educational establishments whose study course is 10 months or more and who are provided with uniform clothing and meals under USSR Government decisions, R40 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R45 a month; and for those with all excellent assessments, R50 a month; for students classified as family students, R50 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R55; and for those with all excellent assessments, R60 a month; for students who are the children of servicemen who were killed or of persons categorized on the same footing as Group I and Group II Great Patriotic War invalids, R60 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R70; and for those with all excellent assessments, R85 a month; for students classified as family students, R70 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also all good or excellent assessments, R80; and for those with all excellent assessments, R95 a month;
for students who are orphans or have been left without parental care and who are maintained on state security, R80 a month; of these, for students with all good assessments, and also those with all good or excellent assessments, R90; and for those with all excellent assessments, R105 a month.

The existing levels of grants for postgraduate students and students studying for doctorates are to be increased by R60 a month.

It is stipulated that students receiving grants for which new scales are not specified in the present resolution are to be paid compensation as follows: at higher educational establishments, R60 a month; and at secondary specialized educational establishments, R55 a month. The USSR State Committee for Public Education and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Finance, are to prepare proposals on the levels of grants for the said category of young people, and to submit them to the USSR Council of Ministers within a month.

For Retirees, Invalids, and Family Members With No Breadwinner

26. In order to compensate for the rise in prices, there is to be an increase of R65 a month, for nonworking

pensioners, in old-age pensions, length-of-service pensions, invalidity pensions, pensions occasioned by the loss of the breadwinner, and social pensions, and also in supplements for family members who are unable to work and dependent nonworking retirees who do not receive compensation on other grounds.

For children who have lost both parents, pensions occasioned by the loss of the breadwinner are to be increased by twice the aforementioned sum.

For working retirees, compensation payments in connection with the reform of retail prices are to be made according to the procedure laid down for workers and employees.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the USSR Ministry of Finance, with the participation of the General Confederation of Trade Unions of the USSR, the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], and the USSR KGB, are to submit proposals within a month on the procedure for calculating the average monthly wage for the purpose of setting pensions in connection with the increase in wage rates and salary scales associated with compensation for the increase in retail prices, and also on the procedure for calculating pensions for servicemen and for enlisted men and command personnel of internal affairs organs taking into account the introduction of compensation payments.

27. Republic governments are to examine the question of the procedure for and levels of compensation to be paid from republic budget resources for expenditure relating to the implementation of social and consumer privileges, including those relating to the acquisition of means of transport, stipulated under current legislation for invalids, as well as the capital repair of means of transport for war and labor veterans and other categories of citizens, and also the procedure for settling accounts arising from this between the relevant organs (organizations).

28. It is recommended that republic governments and local soviets of people's deputies supplement monetary compensation for poorly-off strata of the population with various types of social assistance (including assistance in kind)—the granting of tax concessions; the provision of municipal and social services; the allocation of plots of land and garden cabins on concessionary terms; the issuing of packages of food products and essential industrial goods especially for children, invalids, pensioners, and other socially unprotected population strata, free or with partial compensation for their cost; the payment of bills for medicines and special products for invalids and the elderly; free meals; the granting of concessions for the use of urban and suburban transport; and other forms of aid.

For Servicemen

29. Salary scales are to be increased from 1 May 1991:

for officer personnel, warrant officers, petty officers, and servicemen on extended service, by R80 a month; for enlisted men and command personnel in internal affairs organs, by R60 a month;

for servicemen on compulsory service, students at Suvorov military schools and Nakhimov naval schools, students enrolled in military bands, and cadets, by R20 a month; for students at military educational establishments without officer rank, by R60 a month.

For the period from the day of the increase in state retail prices until 1 May 1991, such persons are to be paid monetary compensation on the basis of the said levels.

Compensation is paid to military construction workers at the level of R60 a month.

30. Expenditure on food, kit, medical, and other types of material provision for servicemen, military construction workers, enlisted men and command personnel, workers and employees, and pensioners of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD, the USSR KGB, the railroad troops, and the military restoration administration of the USSR Ministry of Communications is to be increased on such a scale as to compensate for the increase in prices for these types of material provision.

31. Compensation payments are to be introduced for nonworking wives of servicemen and enlisted men and command personnel of internal affairs organs at remote garrisons and localities where there is no opportunity to find jobs for them (the procedure and conditions for classifying troop units, institutions, and internal affairs organs as stationed in remote garrisons and localities are laid down by the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD, and the USSR KGB by agreement with the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the USSR Ministry of Finance).

Compensation payments for the nonworking wives of such persons are to take place at the husband's place of service, at the level of R60 a month.

32. Compensation payments for workers and employees and nonworking and working pensioners of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD, and the USSR KGB are to take place according to the procedure and conditions laid down for people working in the national economy and pensioners.

33. The increase in the pay of servicemen and of enlisted men and command personnel, the wages of workers and employees, and the pensions of nonworking pensioners of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD, the USSR KGB, the railroad troops, and the military restoration administration of the USSR Ministry of Communications, and payments of allowances to families with children in these categories, are to take place under the procedure and according to the scales laid down by the present resolution, taking into account decisions on these questions adopted by republic government bodies.

The USSR Ministry of Finance, in conjunction with the said ministries and committee, is to determine the procedure, scales, and conditions for the payment of compensation.

For the Unemployed

34. Citizens who have lost their job and wage (labor income) and who are registered at the state employment service as people seeking work shall for the period of vocational training, skill improvement, or retraining be paid compensation of R50 a month in addition to the grant for the entire training period.

Citizens deemed in the prescribed manner to be unemployed are to be paid compensation of R50 a month in addition to their unemployment allowance. The duration of the payment of the compensation is to be determined in accordance with article 28 of the Fundamentals of the law of the USSR and the republics on the employment of the population.

Other Compensation Measures

35. The USSR Ministry of Finance together with the USSR State Committee for Public Education, the USSR Ministry of Health, the USSR Ministry of Culture, and other ministries and departments of the USSR concerned are to increase monetary norms of expenditure on catering, the acquisition of soft furnishings and clothing, and cultural, consumer, and household items, and for training purposes in hospitals, polyclinics, preschool institutions, schools, children's homes and boarding schools, homes for the aged and disabled, and other organizations under Union jurisdiction. They are to ensure the prompt financing of those institutions and organizations in accordance with the enhanced norms.

The republics' governments are instructed to ensure the prompt implementation of similar work for the aforementioned institutions, financed from republic and local budgets.

36. Wage rates and salary scales for people kept in corrective labor institutions shall be increased by at least R60 a month. From the increase in the wage of the aforementioned people no money is top be withheld for the partial compensation of expenditure on the upkeep of those institutions.

37. Proceeding from the premise that the compensation payments to the population in connection with the increase in prices are not to be clawed back by the system of taxation of the incomes of citizens and of the profits of enterprises, the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR Ministry of Justice are to draft proposals on amendments to the USSR Law "On taxation of the income of USSR citizens, foreign citizens, and stateless persons," the USSR Law "On taxes from enterprises, associations, and organizations," and the USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution "On the procedure for enacting the USSR Law 'On taxes from enterprises, associations, and organizations'," with a view to increasing the scale of the tax-exempt monthly wage and other incomes of citizens to R160 inclusive and to reducing the scale of income tax from citizens' incomes in excess of R160 a month, applying here a progressive scale of tax above 13 percent for incomes of more than R1,000 a month instead of the previously established R700;
rates of tax on the profits of enterprises and organizations are to be lowered to 35 percent and the ceiling of the average monthly wage of workers engaged in the main activity of enterprises attributable to output prime costs is to be raised to R480.

38. Note is to be taken of the fact that the USSR Gosbank and the USSR Savings Bank, by agreement with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, will implement measures to compensate holders of deposits and certificates for losses incurred using 1 March 1991 as the basis [po sostoyaniyu na 1 marta 1991] and the USSR Ministry of Finance will do likewise for holders of state securities issued to the population in connection with the one-off increase in retail prices.

39. It is laid down that in regions and localities where coefficients are applied to wages for having to live in difficult natural and climatic conditions, the grants and allowances newly introduced or increased in accordance with the present resolution and also pension, allowance, and grant compensations are to be increased taking account of the coefficients applicable for workers in nonproduction sectors.

40. A single union-republic finance fund for the social support of the population is to be formed using some of the resources obtained from the increase in retail prices to ensure the established minimum compensation payments to the population in all republics and also to servicemen and other citizens in receipt of incomes from union budget resources.

The USSR Ministry of Finances, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR State Committee for Prices, and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions together with the republic governments are instructed to submit within 2 months proposals on the scales and procedure for the formation and expenditure of the resources of the aforementioned fund.

In connection with the increase in the scales of all types of pensions and allowances, the USSR Ministry of Finance together with the USSR Pension Fund and the USSR Social Insurance Fund are to determine the procedure for reimbursing those funds for the additional cost of paying compensation.

41. Guided by the Agreement of the USSR and the Republics on Questions of the Reform of Retail Prices and Social Protection of the Population, the republic governments and local soviet executive committees shall, when revaluing commodities in the light of the introduction of new state retail, regulated, and free prices and the implementation of measures for making compensation payments to the population, ensure the

strict implementation of the principles of the reform of retail prices and social protection for the population and promptly prevent possible abuses.

42. Labor remuneration for workers of institutions, banks, and communications enterprises, social security organs directly involved in calculating and making compensation payments in connection with the reform of retail prices for work outside normal work time and on holidays shall be paid in accordance with articles 40 and 41 of the Fundamentals of the USSR and Union Republics' Labor Legislation.

43. The USSR State Committee for Prices and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions together with the USSR Ministry of Justice and the USSR Ministry of Finance are to submit to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers within 1 month proposals on the implementation of the USSR Government's decisions in accordance with the present resolution.

44. The USSR State Committee for Statistics and the USSR Ministry of Finance, together with the USSR State Committee for Prices and with the involvement of the USSR Gosbank, the USSR Pension Fund, and the USSR Social Insurance Fund, are within 2 weeks to elaborate an accounting system and organize the collection of information on changes in revenue for goods and services in connection with the increase in retail prices, budget income, and compensation payments to the population.

Enterprises and institutions, regardless of their departmental subordination and form of ownership, must provide the necessary information over and above the set forms of statistical accounting.

45. The USSR State Committee for Prices, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Gosplan, and the USSR Ministry of Finance, are, where necessary, to provide clarifications on the procedure for the application of the present resolution.

46. The USSR Finance Ministry is to submit proposals on the more precise definition of income and expenditure in the 1991 union budget and submit amendments and additions to the USSR Law "On the 1991 Union Budget."

[Signed] V. Pavlov, prime minister,
M. Shkabardnya, administrator of affairs.

Shcherbakov Details Price Rises, Compensation

LD2103122191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1925 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov by correspondent Natalya Chernysheva; place and date not given; from the "Topical Interview" program—recorded]

[Text] [Chernysheva] Vladimir Ivanovich, the increase in prices is a major event in our country. One person I was talking to about prices described it as a revolutionary event. Do you agree with that definition? What is your general attitude to the event itself?

[Shcherbakov] This is not simply an everyday event, it is beyond comparison, perhaps, with any previous decision on the transition to a market economy because here in fact we are dealing with the very foundation; we are dealing with the freedom of the producer and the freedom of the consumer, and in the final analysis we are taking things to the quintessence of the market, to the correlation between supply and demand.

There is a great deal of talk these days about this being simply a price reform. I think that that is a fundamental mistake because it is not simply a question of raising prices, it is a question of radically reforming the entire system of price-setting, and what is most important the system whereby the incomes of the population are formed. Until now we have had a fairly simple system. It has been in operation for almost all the 70 years. We maintained firm prices in the state shops. Essentially we didn't have any others. The consumer cooperatives also mainly adhered to state prices. And since we maintained fixed prices we also maintained fixed wages. We observed that balance the whole time. As a result, of course, we incurred some very major disadvantages. On the one hand prices broke away from the real cost of production. As a result the main landmark or pointer that the enterprise had—the price—provided a distorted idea of the real demand for its goods and of course we were obliged to use all kinds of coercive methods to get these goods produced. Now we are moving away from this entire system. That is one side of the problem.

The other side is that some very major social problems can be solved. Last year, for example, for foodstuffs alone we gave out subsidies of around 120 billion rubles [R] and this year we would have given out about R200 billion. If this is translated into ordinary human terms it means that we are falling short in what we pay to the person to hand over this money later to the producer. Outwardly the balance might look like that, but in actual fact this system causes a huge number of very serious social consequences. First, it is simply unfair socially, because we subsidize every kilogram of meat to the tune of approximately R8; we subsidise butter by R15 - 17, and so on. To whom do these subsidies really go? They go to the people who consume most. The result, therefore, is that in a family with average per capita income the level of subsidy is approximately five times lower than in a family with an income of R200 [per capita]. One eats 100 kg of meat, the other eats 20 kg of meat. To whom are we giving the subsidies under that kind of system? To the people who eat most, of course. But the market on the contrary presupposes freedom for both consumer and producer. I believe, therefore, that this is a very serious, major step. All the same it must be looked at within the context of all the events, because it cannot be said that this step alone will solve everything. There has to be a whole complex of measures here to create the whole market infrastructure.

[Chernysheva] In other words this is not the last step, but the first step, the raising of...

[Shcherbakov, interrupting] I wouldn't say that it was the first, because we have a mass of prepared decisions dealing with interest rate policy, credit policy, the taxation system, we have at last created something more or less similar to the civilized world. This first not the first step, therefore, but I think that in the context of these events it is perhaps the most important, and no doubt the one that is the most difficult from the social point of view.

[Chernysheva] Vladimir Ivanovich, I understand your enthusiasm for and your interest in economics in general, but I personally, for example, am waiting with great impatience for the moment when we get on to our main topic, to the subsidies and the handing back of what the state now takes from us. Let's determine the percentage of the total increase in the prices of goods and services that will be compensated.

[Shcherbakov] Our plan is that from the increase in retail prices—and as you know the increases take effect in different layers, there are state fixed prices, there are regulated prices and there are the so-called contractual or [word indistinct] prices—there are various names for them.

[Chernysheva] Free prices, yes.

[Shcherbakov] Essentially free prices, and the toal gain to the state from these three sources could theoretically amount to approximately 311 billion. We are planning to direct 85 percent of this into compensation for the population.

[Chernysheva] Excuse me, radical economists no doubt will ask why are you carrying out the reform if you are returning everything?

[Shcherbakov] I think that if we are to talk in overall terms, then generally speaking we are simply restoring social justice. But we used to take this money from people. We simply gave it out to the producer. But now it has to be taken from the producer and returned to the person from whom it was taken. Almost 40 percent of workers in our country today receive pay lower than 180 rubles on average.

[Chernysheva] Do you call 180 rubles the minimum living wage?

[Shcherbakov] The new minimum living wage will no doubt be close to that figure. Discussions are still taking place about this. Now as to why we're not directing 100 percent; well, in the first place there are a number of goods on which in our view it is permissible not to return the increases: For example, we are not raising the prices for vodka, for ordinary vodka; but for cognacs of various kinds we are raising them, for third and fourth generation color television receivers—I've taken a look at this list and it includes things like particularly fashionable manufactures of light industry, or specially produced footwear for masters of sport; all this, of course, has to be put outside the brackets.

[Chernysheva] Vladimir Ivanovich, excuse me, but interpretation is very important here, because I could apply that designation—particularly fashionable goods—virtually to any goods. It is very imprecise. In diplomacy, you know, they use the kind of definition that cannot be interpreted in different ways. But unfortunately these are vague.

[Shcherbakov] I have to say that this list of what is to be included and not included is not decided by the USSR Government. The USSR Government has agreed only the rules for regulating prices with all the republics, and subsequently the specific selection of what is compensated for and what is not compensated for is decided by the republics on the basis of their understanding of this issue.

And there is a second side to this question of why we cannot agree to 100 percent compensation, because we are doing all our calcualtions on the basis of last year, on the basis of the actual consumption by the population of goods from state resources. And here the result is that so far this year we have a all in the volume of production. We have produced nearly 4 percent less in terms of consumer goods, say; and we have produced nearly 13 percent less in terms of agricultural output. This money, therefore, might simply turn out not to be there.

There is also a third side. We are nevertheless establishing by agreement between all the republics minimal guarantees, a maximum level of prices and a minimum guarantee, there is a relationship between them. If you raise prices to a figure lower than the maximum—for example, Uzbekistan considers that the price of bread and perhaps even the price of flour should not now be increased to the maximum figure because it is a basic foodstuff—in that case, naturally, they are able to reduce the compensation by a certain sum. So there is a minimum and there is a maximum for prices. And of course the republics can add to this, and the enterprises, too, can add to it and they must do so, but they must be left with a certain reserve.

[Chernysheva] I would like you to make it clear once again. A maximum price has been set. No one can, no one has the right to exceed it. If meat costs seven rubles, it cannot be sold anywhere at a higher price?

[Shcherbakov] It cannot so be sold in the state retail network or if it comes from state resources. For example, the consumer cooperatives sell a lot of output from state resources. That output cannot be sold at prices higher than the maximum. Eggs, for example, depending on the category and various criteria, have a maximum price of 2.60 rubles. Today they are being sold for three rubles and more. Therefore it will be 2.60 and no higher. Meat is today being sold for nine rubles; in the Baltic republics it is being sold for 11 rubles. We have agreed seven rubles and no higher. Of course there is the collective

farm market, of course there are the cooperatives, other price-setting rules operate there. That is a free market, it is supply and demand, and this does not therefore extend to them.

[Chernysheva] How will the law be extended to the republics? I think we will be able to reach agreement in Uzbekistan, but in the Baltic republics prices are much higher. Comrade Senchagov indeed said that as an economist he would not reduce them.

[Shcherbakov] Well, this issue is more of a political nature. First, we think the Supreme Soviet will nevertheless adopt this decision. We will give instructions to the tax inspectorates and to the price inspectorates to remove from the budget any difference in price rises, if there are such cases, and to do so without question and completely so that they are of no interest for producers. Second, if certain regions do not submit to this general agreement, which I emphasize is not from the center but from all the republics—all the republics signed this agreement—if someone does not submit, we will then put forward proposals that may be fairly harsh. We will then provide supplies to these regions with a surcharge. Let us say that cotton is being provided from Uzbekistan to the Baltic republics at firm prices. If the Baltic republics do not accept the maximum level of prices, then cotton will be supplied at a different price. We will then take this money and hand it over.

[Chernysheva] I see. Now I think we will move on to specific compensation. I suggest that we take a hypothetical family. The father works, the mother works, one child is five years of age, and a second child is 15 years old. The grandmother, a pensioner, does not work. The grandfather is a pensioner, but does work. This is our fairly large family.

[Shcherbakov] Well, let us try and calculate it. I cannot, of course, remember everything, but let us try. The first person is the father, is that right?

[Chernysheva] Yes, the father.

[Shcherbakov] The father will get at the factory a minimum of 60 rubles as an increase in the rate of his earnings. At first he will receive this via a separate list on the 20th, or in places on the second, and if some people receive it a few days later it is not that dreadful. Afterwards, these 60 rubles will form part of his rate of earnings or salary, and naturally there will also be bonuses, additional payments, extra payments, and all the rest. That is to say, he will get a minimum of 60 rubles.

[Chernysheva] And what about taxes?

[Shcherbakov] Taxes will be reduced by this amount. At present we begin 13 percent tax on 100 rubles and above. Now this figure will be 160 rubles. This will not only apply to those who receive 100 rubles. You will remember that we have a progressive scale which under union legislation begins at present at 700 rubles. Since the whole shift is in accordance with a scale, the progressive tax will start not at 700 rubles, but at 1,000 rubles. Therefore, this money that is received by the father or the mother will not be taken away in taxation. It will remain with them.

[Chernysheva] So the father gets 60 rubles.

[Shcherbakov] Mother is working, is she not?

[Chernysheva] Yes, the mother works.

[Shcherbakov] The mother also gets a minimum of 60 rubles. In this regard I would emphasize that the enterprise may decide on more, if it has money for this, and there may be additional earnings, extra payments or a bonus. Therefore, realistically she will get 60 rubles or a little more. Now, with regard to the grandmother.

[Chernysheva] First, let us deal with the children. The preschool child is five years old.

[Shcherbakov] I see, the preschool child is five, is he? Well, at that age the preschool child will get 80 rubles. And the second child is 15, is he?

[Chernysheva] Yes, 15.

[Shcherbakov] Well, a 15-year-old child comes within the 6-16 years category and will get 40 rubles.

[Chernysheva] Why does a five-year old get R80 and the 15-year old child get R40?

[Shcherbakov] It is because we have the following approach in this respect. We consider that it is necessary to extend a greater degree of assistance when the parents are still young, and especially when they still have young children and young families. Well, if a wife has a child, up till one and a half years of age she will get R110, and between one and a half and six years of age she will get R80, as I have said.

[Chernysheva] I see.

[Shcherbakov] Previously, we did not have benefits above the age of six years. Now we are introducing a special benefit of R40 until the child finishes school or, if the mother is on her own, a little longer. In addition, they are due to receive special compensation for increases in the price of a range of goods for children. Thus, depending on what goods they require, they get the following: up to six years R200 annually; to 13 years, R240; and up to 16 years, R280. Therefore, our 15-year-old here will get R280 and the other R200 annually. In addition, we now get to the grandmother and grandfather, do we not?

[Chernysheva] Our grannie is a pensioner and does not work.

[Shcherbakov] A grannie pensioner, who does not work, will receive R65 at once, this being in addition to any pension she receives.

[Chernysheva] Grandad is a pensioner and works.

[Shcherbakov] Grandad works. If grandad works, he will receive an additional R60, just as all those working. When he finally retires on pension, then his pension will be recalculated. Now the figure is R65.

[Chernysheva] ok.

[Shcherbakov] Well, let's add it al up: R180, plus R120, plus R65, in total 365 and in addition R280...

[Chernysheva, interrupting]...and R200.

[Shcherbakov]... and R200—R480 divided by 12 months—that's R40, so we add R40 and in total we have at least R405, which such a family will receive, I stress, at least. Because the papa and mama and grandad who are working are to receive more than R60 in real terms. Of course, if this family lives in a region where a regional coefficient is applied, then this amount needs to be simply multiplied by the regional coefficient to make the calculation easy. Each compensatory additional payment is, without fail, multiplied by the regional coefficient.

[Chernysheva] I understand. Vladimir Ivanovich, you say that for papa and mama this is a minimum they will receive. I have read in the decision that the enterprise may increase the amount of compensation.

[Shcherbakov] Yes.

[Chernysheva] From what funds will it be taking this, on the one hand. On the other hand, does this apply to these enterprises and institutions which are on the state budget?

[Shcherbakov] Yes, this applies to all enterprises. Only the mechanism will be different. Therefore, we began with the fact that we must create a socially orientated market economy. This means that those who cannot work for objective reasons, who are not yet capable of working, or are already incapable of working - a disabled person—for these we ensure increased protection and give direct financial support. Whereas, the active, so to speak, sections of the people, the able-bodied, we are setting free—earn as much as you can. We have abolished restrictions on holding more than one office, on combining jobs. Now, with this decision of the Council of Ministers we have a fundamentally different wages foundation. Now the wage rates and salaries which were approved by the decision of the government will not limit wages, as previously, but will be the lower boundary. One should not pay any less. Whatever you earn more than that; it's all yours. The maximum ceilings for wages increments, bonuses and supplementary payments are being abolished. That is to say, work whatever you earn, it's all yours.

[Chernysheva] And one can do anything?

[Shcherbakov] Yes. The only thing which remains is the taxation system. Now, the enterprises must work. We are reducing profit tax from 45 percent to 35 percent. Please, build up production, improve it. Then you will be earning additional money, and you will find ways of using it.

[Chernysheva] Now we will turn to the teachers, cleaners, sales assistants.

[Shcherbakov] Here the method is as follows. First, we decided that this system of compensation needs to be implemented to equalize the base at which all enter the market. We carried out a wage increase in production sectors, but outside the production sectors we carried it out, first, late, and second, to a lesser extent. Therefore, out of the overall amount of compensation, we take out of the brackets approximately R17 billion and we target this toward raising wages for, well, as I see it, the part of the population which is squeezed most today. This is medical personnel. These are teaching staff, both in schools, technical colleges, vocational training schools and institutions of higher learning; artistic personnel, and on the whole all creative personnel in the sphere of culture—librarians—cultural and educational institutions and other workers. Take the teacher with a higher education, no special category, he's arrived today from college. Today, he used to receive 130-150 rubles. He is going to receive 260 rubles. But if he's an experienced person in the top category, then he used to get 210 and he's going to get 350 rubles.

[Chernysheva] In addition, there will be no restriction on the number of hours worked. It could then be one and half times the rate.

[Shcherbakov] Yes, this is his standard rate. Kindergartens. Simply no one wants to work in kindergartens today, with our own children. Let's take the senior teacher. His pay will increase from 170 to 270, and in the case of the most experienced ones to 360. As far as the ordinary kindergarten teacher is concerned, with secondary education, the pay today has been 150, or rather from 110 to 150 rubles. It is going to be 240 rubles. I could give more examples.

[Chernysheva] What about the engineer?

[Shcherbakov] As far as engineers are concerned, I repeat it once again, complete emancipation is taking place. Today, our most highly qualified engineer, the design engineer, say, received a maximum salary of 260. Now that is to be increased by 60, making a total of 320 rubles. But, we say, by all means, if he's working on an important matter, if he's working well, give him any additional payment or supplement, whatever you like. If he has to be given 600 rubles, then give him 600.

[Chernysheva] But if there aren't any additions of that kind?

[Shcherbakov] This, you know, is one of the main issues which in my opinion very few people want to take in. Perhaps people are frightened by these new prices. When there's a 200 percent increase it's rejected psychologically. But the main task here amounts to this, to the

introduction of a real labor market, so that we don't have the kind of situation where no matter where you go you're worth 60 kopecks an hour. As long as we retain the old system of price setting and the old system of regulating the cost of labor, then we can't talk of any economic freedom of the individual whatsoever.

[Chernysheva] Vladimir Ivanovich, a few words about students and servicemen. What benefits await them?

[Shcherbakov] As far as students are concerned, here, too, there is a two-fold kind of solution. You remember that our students used to receive 40 rubles, quite recently. Then, beginning 1 January, they started to receive 60 rubles. Now all students grants are being increased by 60 rubles. Thus, the ordinary student in a higher educational institution, making progress, will have 120 rubles. If he's doing well and excellently, if he's studying, well he'll get 135 rubles. If he's studying excellently, he'll get 150 rubles. In the technical colleges, the grant is 100 rubles, and in the vocational training schools it will be 80 rubles on average. There are certain special features here, of course, but those are the basic figures. As for servicemen, I'll simply read it out to you so that it's as straightforward as possible.

[Chernysheva] Yes, do that.

[Scherbakov] Here is what the document says—For those in the officers' corps, ensigns, warrant officers, re-engaged servicemen, R80 per month. For servicemen engaged for a fixed period, members of the Suvorov and Nakhimov academies, musical pupils and students, R20 per month. For students at military colleges which do not have officer rank, R60 per month. For military construction workers, also R60.

Apart from this, there will be an increase in monetary allowances and goods' allowance. So, there the compensation will be corrected appropriately. In many remote garrisons and localities where the wives do not have the opportunity to work, there is simply nowhere, these wives will also receive a special allowance of R60, in those garrions where they are unable to work. The list of such garrisons has been agreed by the Defense Ministry, the KGB and the Interior Ministry, as appropriate to each one, and this will be announced very soon.

[Chernysheva] There are very great disagreements in society about housing. There is talk of privatizing housing, there is talk of selling some individual apartments, or simply of raising payments for communal services and housing. What do you think? [Shcherbakov] Well, in the first place, communal services are not increasing in cost, and the payment for an apartment is not being increased. We especially left this question aside. All the republics agreed not to touch it for now. We shall resolve this problem at the same time as housing reform, and material on this is now being prepared. I do not want to dwell on this. We shall discuss when it is put forward.

[Chernysheva] Now, about transportation. I know air and railway and water transportation tickets have increased in price.

[Shcherbakov] We are collecting all of this money into the total amount of compensation and returning it to the population. But we have asked the Civil Aviation Ministry and the Merchant Marine Ministry to reexamine this because we have regions where everyone has to get onto aircraft or river transportation. Therefore, perhaps the price increase may not take place, and the old prices may be retained. The comrades are now working on this. We still have time for this.

[Chernysheva] We receive many questions about savings accounts. it is said that there will be a policy of confiscation, or else there will be some change.

[Shcherbakov] I am pleased to say that the USSR State Bank is no longer subordinate to the USSR Government, and has been made a department under the Supreme Soviet. Of course, we work with it. We know, more or less, about its proposals. We are not totally in agreement, so discussions are continuing. But the decision will be made by the bank itself, and not by the USSR Government. So, on this matter, I recommend that you address Comrade Gerashchenko. In order to calm the population, I would like to say that no confiscation measures are envisaged here. None at all.

[Chernysheva] What is your opinion? Will the overall rise in prices affect the sales network? Will things appear in the shops?

[Shcherbakov] That is the central question. If goods appear, then the aim of the reform will have been achieved, because the main object is to get goods into the market. Today, the difference between wholesale and retail prices prevents them from reaching the market. Selling these goods makes a loss. Quite large reserves have built up of food and televisions, washing machines and domestic goods, which are simply unprofitable to sell. Everyone is waiting for the new prices. Noone is going to sell things at a loss. These goods will go on sale.

In the second place, for the first time producers of consumer goods will receive a real source of financing for the development of production, and real profitability from these goods. Of course, the present price reform will give only a temporary balance to the market. If this is not backed by an increase in volume, then it will be very bad. We are now working on special measures on this subject, so as not just to hope that the process of improvement will take place, but to be really sure that this process will take place.

[Chernysheva] What is your opinion? Will the rise in prices accelerate the inflationary processes? What will happen next, after we have carried out the price reform?

[Shcherbakov] I do not think that the price reform should accelerate the inflationary processes. If it is carried out in the way that the republics have agreed, in

an organized and coordinated manner, we will manage to avoid any monetary outflow.

Our future prospects are these: We shall consistently conduct a policy of liberalizing prices, while preserving a list of prices on which we shall maintain strict maximum prices. We are going to gradually set the others free. Of course, prices will most likely continue to increase for some time until supply is in balance. Therefore, we shall introduce a mechanism to index incomes. I have spoken about the consumer basket. It includes quite a lot of goods, about 300. The dynamics of prices of these 300 goods will be monitored. The percentage increase in prices will be calculated and the population's incomes should be increased correspondingly.

We are now working on this. You probably saw in the presidential decree that we have been given two weeks to finalize it with the republics. We have received the conclusions from all the republics. On the whole, they support our proposals. There are some slight nuances. I think that in the next few days we shall remove these and we shall put forward the proposals on this to the president.

[Chernysheva] Vladimir Ivanovich, you use the phrase from all the republics. From all of them?

[Shcherbakov] Yes.

[Chernysheva] From Armenia and Georgia and the Baltics?

[Shcherbakov] Yes, this is a case in which Armenia, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have all sent in their criticisms and their proposals. Because, you understand, we have very intense political confrontation, but everyone has a much better understanding of the economic part. Therefore, at the level of the governemnt of the USSR there are normal contacts with the governments of these republics.

Commentary on Conservative Price Reform

LD1803230591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Aleksandr Zelenkov commentary]

[Text] Prime Minister Pavlov announced on "Vremya" yesterday that prices are to be raised on 2 April. Compensation to the population will begin to be paid from 20 March. According to the calculations of the Russian Finance Ministry, the cost of compensation for the Republic's population will total R146 billion. The rise in prices in Russia will total R200 billion to R212 billion. This means that R60 to 65 billion will be removed from the population's pockets. It is still not clear in this case how the compensation to people's savings bank accounts will be made.

The reform of price formation was decided upon a long time ago. It is essential. But it was a matter of a reform changing the actual mechanism for price formation. A reform which will permit a departure from the system of the bureaucratic, centralized setting of prices and a move to a market, economic, mechanism for their formation. Unfortunately, Pavlov's price reform once more proposes the administrative raising of state prices. Besides this, contract prices will be introduced with the limits to which they can be raised already fixed and there will be free prices. About 30 percent of the turnover in retail goods will be covered by free prices. What are the possible consequences of such a rise in prices?

Taking into account that after 2 April large quantities of goods now stored away should enter into circulation, and also taking into account that there will be a noticeable fall in the buying power of the population, it would seem reasonable to expect that, at last, goods will appear on the shelves in our shops. However, in conjunction with the fact that the introduction of new state prices does not envisage fundamental changes to the mechanism for price formation, and practically preserves all the current distortions within the price system, then it can be expected that in a month or two, the shortage of goods will once more be felt to be worsening.

Anyway, this is what the weekly paper KOMMERSANT and a number of independent experts predict.

Specialists from the International Monetary Fund have prepared a special report devoted to the state of the Soviet economy and the possible ways of carrying out economic reforms. The report notes that if the conservative option for the reform is selected from all the possible options for reforming prices—that is to say, the one that the Pavlov cabinet is carrying out today—then this year in the USSR there could be a sharp drop in the Gross National Product, unemployment could approximately triple and inflation could exceed 50 percent.

After all, even the present government of Gorbachev and Pavlov will be forced to embark on carrying out serious, radical reforms which the democratic forces have been proposing for a long time now. But how much time is still needed until this will happen? And what will it cost us?

Gorbachev Alerted to Plight of Construction

PM2203110191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

["Open Letter to M.S. Gorbachev: With Extreme Concern"]

[Text] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich!

Our names are very familiar to you. We might even not have bothered to mention the posts which we held until quite recently—especially as both in the past and in the current situation they require the psychologically upsetting rider: "former."

It is not the word itself that is upsetting. Ultimately it reflects the dialectics of human life: Everything passes,

just like life itself... What is upsetting is the powerlessness which it engenders and which prevents us from having any real opportunity to influence the processes we are experiencing.

Gathering at the All-Union Scientific and Technical Society of Construction Workers during these difficult days for the country, it was with a sense of profound concern and professional and civic responsibility that we exchanged opinions on the causes of the present crisis in capital construction, and discussed the ways and means of surmounting it as quickly as possible.

Our appeal to you, the president of our great country, is a reflection of our unbearable pain and alarm about capital construction—the very economic sector on which, in your own words, "not only the development of our basic national economic complex, but the entire process of social reproduction depends." We would add for our part that the very existence of our society and Soviet people's lives depend on it too.

That is why we are fully resolved to draw your attention to the increase in negative trends in capital construction—trends which have lately been accompanied by an unconcealed collapse in its management structures, the destruction of economic ties that took decades to emerge, and a sharp fall in contractual, technological, and production discipline. Professional cadres are leaving the construction industry in droves. For instance, in 1990 alone the construction organizations of Moscow and Leningrad lost around 40,000 people. The pathetic budget appropriation for construction science, which amounts to just 1 percent of total construction appropriations, is clearly out of line with capital construction's 10-12-percent share of GNP.

The decline in the physical volume of capital construction evident in recent years has predetermined the general slump in the functioning of the national economy.

A real threat hangs over the resolution of the housing problem in the country—one of the priorities of the perestroyka you initiated and the main factor in the provision of facilities for human life. The positive dynamic achieved in housing construction in 1986-1988 (119.8 million square meters in 1986; 131.4 million in 1987; and 132.3 million in 1988) has been abruptly shattered in the past two years—the figure for 1989 was 128.9 million square meters, and in 1990 it was just 115 million. The people failed to receive around 600,000 planned apartments last year. An extremely dangerous trend is being maintained here, and there is no hope that it will be possible to halt it in the near future. The decree adopted by you in this sphere has clearly been left up in the air.

More serious shortcomings are occurring in the construction of production facilities. Even given the significant reduction of investment in this area (and this in itself, in our view, is by no means unchallengeable) the scale of certain national economic complexes' failure to fulfill plan targets has been striking. Of the 746 facilities [moshchnosti] covered by state orders in 1990 only 289, or 39 percent, have been commissioned. This represented 55 percent of the requirement in the fuel and energy complex, 62 percent in the machine building complex, 34 percent in the agro-industrial complex, and 70 percent in the defense complex. There is essentially a crisis in the metallurgical complex, where just 23.6 percent of the capacity planned for 1990 has been commissioned.

The volume of unfinished construction work is not only failing to fall, it is actually starting to outstrip the annual level of capital investment (105 percent in 1990 as against 79 percent in 1985-1988).

Compared with the 11th Five-Year Plan, which has recently been called a period of stagnation, the 12th Five-Year Plan resulted in a sharp drop in the commissioning of the most important national economic capacity: by 25 percent in electricity generation, 39 percent in rolled ferrous metals, 80 percent in iron ore extraction, 60 percent in caustic soda and soda ash, and 6.2 percent in synthetic yarns and fibers. The scale of this disruption in the 12th Five-Year Plan is threateningly huge and essentially reduces to naught all the efforts to improve the economy.

Of course, the current crisis in capital construction is not just a "child of perestroyka." Moreover, we should fully share the responsibility for the current state of affairs in the sector and agree that we failed to achieve a great deal in our time. The development of construction was always uneven, and the problems and shortcomings that emerged in it caused concern among party, state, and soviet organs. But it did not only cause concern—it was accompanied by heightened attention to and consideration of this economic sector's role and place in the functioning of the national economy.

The lack of proper attention to capital construction, and to its needs and concerns is the main problem today and the cause of our pain and profound suffering. Elevated almost to the rank of a genotype, our deformed social awareness rates construction work one of the most ignoble of human professions, and makes it undervalued and unpopular among young people.

The importance of capital construction is declared, but little of a specific nature is done to meet its need, develop the material and technical base, or improve construction workers' social and consumer conditions. It is construction work that has the highest percentage of manual work and, most importantly, of women's work.

The extremely backward technical standard of the construction materials industry and the poor provision of modern technology to enterprises in the past decade have been exacerbated by the failure to fulfill CPSU Central Committee and government resolutions. As a result, only 54 percent of capacity for the production of ceramic sanitary and plumbing fittings was commissioned, with the relevant figures being 31 percent for wall

materials, 47 percent for non-ore materials, 49 percent for porous aggregate, 50 percent for cement, 40 percent for precast reinforced concrete structures, and 38 percent for woodwork. How can there be any question of any growth in individual housing construction or of saturating the consumer market in the light of this?

On a broader level the entire sphere of investment activity and the structure of investment demand has been deformed. The granting to every enterprise of the right to use its own funds for these purposes has given rise to an unpredictable flurry of demand for investment. In 1990 alone the number of construction projects on which work was newly started increased by 1,400 instead of falling as planned.

It is clear from USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov's report at the recent USSR Supreme Soviet session and his subsequent replies to questions from people's deputies that the proper importance is not being attached to the role of capital construction in the country's economy. The collapse in the management of this sector since the corresponding position of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers was abolished in the new cabinet is being continued with the abolition of the USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction] as a government organ. The absurdity and strategic shortsightedness of this step is hard to fully assess at the moment. One thing is clear: The last chance of implementing major and effective measures to get capital construction out of its crisis is being lost.

In this case, is there much benefit in discussing the priority of the social sphere if housing is being built at such a rate and in such volumes that the acquisition of an apartments will remain a pipe dream for millions of people? Can we develop widespread production of high-quality consumer goods if there is nobody to build a shop to house the new technology or to modernize existing production facilities? How can we make society's spiritual development full-fledged without erecting buildings for entertainment and educational purposes? How can we talk about people's physical condition and health when there is an enormous need for health-care institutions? These and other questions are not springing up just from nowhere.

On a broader scale we should discuss the coordination of investment activity at the all-union level as one of the fundamental functions of the Cabinet of Ministers set up under the USSR president. If this does not happen, the strategy of socially restructuring the economy and boosting Soviet people's prosperity will remain just a slogan and discredit the country's leadership. The idea that, in the transition to the market, the management of capital construction can be handed over to lower levels of economic activity is an illusion, as time has shown. All the more so, as this is fundamentally at odds with the overall strategy for the development of the national economic complex and the concept for shaping a single economic space.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich!

We realize that it is far easier to provide a "snapshot" of the situation than to rectify it. Therefore, it is perhaps not worthwhile diverting your attention—all the more so as the USSR president is privy to far more information than we are. Nonetheless, we do have something to tell you and advice to give you. We could do this in a meeting. We have behind us not only our years but also our immense human and professional experience. Capital construction cannot develop dynamically without the constructive experience of the past. Without the past the country can have no stable present, much less a bright future. We sincerely hope that you will respond to our appeal.

[Signed] Respectfully yours,
N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]; B.V. Bakin, USSR minister of installation and special construction work; Yu.P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosstroy; S.V. Bashilov, USSR minister of construction in the Urals and West Siberia regions of the USSR; S.F. Voyenushkin, USSR minister of the construction materials industry; N.V. Goldin, USSR minister of the construction of heavy industry enterprises; A.D. Deminov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosstroy; A.D. Dmitriyev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; I.N. Dmitriyev, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; V.I. Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.E. Dymshits, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.I. Mayorets, USSR minister of power and electrification; A.G. Melnikov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; I.T. Novikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosstroy; M.G. Chentemirov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosstroy.

Nazarbayev Meets With Karaganda Coal Miners

3-Month No-Strike Pledge Secured

PM2103145591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 1

[Correspondent V. Komarov report under the "Strike Chronicle" rubric: "Nazarbayev and the Miners"]

[Text] [Kazakh President] Nursultan Nazarbayev described his six-hour trip to see Karaganda's miners as unplanned. In this short space of time, as the result of a thorough, confiding conversation with the miners, he succeeded in securing major concessions from the miners' trade union territorial committee—not to organize strikes for the next three months. N. Nazarbayev pledged to doggedly "push through" at the highest level

all the miners' hitherto unresolved questions. N. Nazarbayev pointed out at the meeting that in the future the republic will take charge of the coal industry. Incidentally, Karaganda's miners expected this step from the president.

I must point out that N. Nazarbayev will henceforth only conduct dialogue with miners' official trade union activists. The oblast workers committee is thus shoved to one side. People in Karaganda are already talking about disbanding it. The appropriate draft decision has already been prepared for the next oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] sitting, and the "Karagandaugol" Association has even disconnected all the telephones in the workers committee building.

Nazarbayev Comments

LD2103171991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1441 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] As we have already reported, the strike by miners of the Karaganda coal basin, which was organized at the beginning of this month following a call by the Karaganda territorial council of trade unions of coalminers and the oblast workers' committee, has been suspended until 30 March. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, met representatives of the labor collectives and the trade union aktiv of the oblast in Karaganda yesterday. A constructive and trust-filled discussion took place about how the problems that have come to a head should after all be tackled. Our correspondent Gennadiy Sytykh interviewed the president of Kazakhstan during the interval:

[Begin recording] [Nazarbayev] I agreed with President Gorbachev when I came here with the leadership of the government. Indeed, at a time when we cannot find the money or the currency to support the miners today, what can we do? We have to do what we can do. They are asking that the miners themselves should be permitted to use five percent of the total quantity of coal extracted and that a general license for that quantity should be given to the republic so that we can sell to foreign companies—if necessary, perhaps, at a contractual price and if we make an agreement. Of course barter exchange is not the best means of dealing with foreign states, but life, together with this entire shortage, forces us to use barter in order to bring in food and industrial goods here and ease living conditions in some way for this difficult time.

Our Karaganda miners have no political questions and issues whatsoever. The first thing is that we have agreed that I personally will now deal with those questions that they have been raised. I am very satisfied with this visit and we have agreed that my representatives will work here regularly and will meet and report on our agreement. I will come here again in three months' time to visit the mines, to meet the people and say what we are resolving, how we are moving forward. I have expressed the idea that we should support the setting up of a state committee for fuel which would not command but would serve the miners. We would then set up a similar fuel committee in Kazakhstan which would include all miners' collectives and the oil men, and we would take complete care of the miners' collectives.

[Stykh] Are you pleased with this kind of agreement? I put this question to the chairman of the coalminers' territorial committee (Petr Shlegel).

[(Shlegel)] What we like is the fact that the president of the republic has undertaken to resolve these issues personally. He has been given a credit of trust, but nevertheless we are not lifting responsibility from the government of the USSR, where our questions have been accepted, and we are awaiting a specific answer from them. Naturally, since in our own republic the president is resolving these questions, we are giving a truce, so to speak, or a moratorium.

[Sytykh] Three months?

[Shlegel] Three months, yes, after which we will report back, and of course the miners there must find satisfaction. [end recording]

Chervonograd Miners Make Demands

LD2103140691 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Representatives of the strike committee of Chervonograd, Lvov region, arrived in Kiev for talks with the republic's government. On strike in Chervonongrad at present are 21 mines, even though work at one of them is periodically revived. Part of the miners are lowered into the pit, but coal is not extracted from any of the mines.

Chairman of the strike committee, Oleg Karpyuk, said the following about the political and economic demands of the miners:

We are demanding liquidation of the presidency, dissolvement [as heard] of the Supreme Soviet and Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union as unnecessary during the building of sovereign states. Among the demands of the miners is the granting of constitutional status to the declaration on state sovereignty of Ukraine. This also includes a demand on releasing People's Deputy of the Ukraine Stepan Khmara from imprisonment, and fulfillment of the demand forwarded in October of last year by the students who waged a hunger strike on holding a referendum on the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet. Among the economic demands is the increase of wages by 2.8 to three times, introducing piece-rate pay at state enterprises of the coal industry. In concluding the interview, Oleg Karpyuk, chairman of the strike committee from Chervonongrad, pointed out that according to preliminary [word indistinct], the republican government agreed to discuss the issues pertaining to wages, pensions, and holidays, but, said Oleg Karpyuk, if all the political issues are not included on the agenda, the miners will refuse to take part in the talks.

Donetsk Strike 'Gathering Momentum'

LD2103135791 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] The miners strike in the Donetsk coal basin is gathering momentum. On Wednesday, 30 mines stood idle. As a result of short shipments of coal, blast furnaces at steel plants in the south of the Ukraine were running well below their capacity. Miners are on strike also in other regions—within the Arctic Circle, in the south of the Ural mountains, outside of Moscow, and in the Far East. According to contradictory figures, the strike is supported by a total of 165 mines. The workers are putting forward both economic and political demands. As the Soviet parliament noted at a session, the conflict has really become drawn out, yet no language of ultimatums must be used.

50 Ukraine Coal Mines Continue Strike

LD2203105191 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] About 50 coal mines out of the 241 in the Ukraine continue their strike. Ukraine's prime minister, Vitold Fokin, commented on the economic demands of the miners. The miners of Ukraine have put forth two main demands, he said. First, they demand that the prices for coal should be raised. We met this demand half-way, and increased prices for coal almost three-fold; this allows miners to have their earnings increased by almost 30 percent. However, we cannot fulfill their demand to raise their wages several times over. Our budget cannot allow us to do this, said Ukraine's prime minister, Vitold Fokin.

Oblast Court Rules Donbass Strike Illegal

LD2103224991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2103 GMT 21 Mar 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The strike by miners in the western Donbass has been judged illegal. The oblast court passed judgement today in an action brought by the management against strike committees. The court decided that the striking miners must return to work the day after the judgement is published.

Coal Industry Minister Contacts Miners

LD2203111491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] A TASS correspondent has reported that in a telegram sent to the managers of associations, combines, enterprises, chairman of territorial committees, and trade union committees, USSR coal Industry Ministry Shchadov noted that, among their strike demands, individual labor collectives are raising the question of the fulfillment of the 3 August 1989 decision no. 608 of the USSR Council of Ministers.

He also reported that the USSR prime minister instructed him to report to the government on the fulfillment of the decision. The report on this which is being prepared will be examined by the USSR Council of Ministers with the participation of representatives of the labor collectives of the country's coal regions after the work of the industry's coal enterprises has been stabilized.

At the same time the minister noted that the miners again demanded that at the meeting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers no demands of a political nature will be examined.

Trade Union Leader To Meet Miners Half Way

LD2103155291

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1200 GMT on 21 March, in its "Television News Service" program, carries a short report by announcer Igor Minayev, who says he just interviewed Sergey Aleksandrovich Dubinin, chairman of the association of trade unions of Neryungri and Yakutiya and member of the state commission for monitoring the 1989 resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the coal miners' demands. Minayev asks Dubinin if the demands have been met. Dubinin says yes, that basically they have all been met, albeit with a big delay. The miners demanded payment for travel from pit shaft to work, more holidays, and extra holidays for the noxious work conditions. In principle, these matters have been settled.

Asked why they strike if their demands have been met, Dubinin says new problems keep arising and now there is a question of conclusion between the Central Council of the Coalminers' Trade Union and the ministry on a general agreement on pay rates.

Asked what he proposes, Dubinin says: "The government, I mean both the Union government and the governments of the republics, should go halfway to meet the coalminers, and not only the coalminers, because the problems that coalminers have are the problems in all the sectors of the national economy. They are those of the metallurgists, aviators, railwaymen, oilmen, and so on. So this new form of work with the government, which is at the level of the working committees and trade union committees on the tackling of these social and labor problems, this form has been worked on for a year and a half, since 1989. It should definitely not be abandoned. Only a dialogue can lead to anything." He says confrontation will lead nowhere.

Agricultural

Yeltsin, Silayev Issue Appeal on Land

914B0122B Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 11, Mar 91 p 1

[Appeal by B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers: "How To Obtain Land"]

[Text] Dear fellow citizens!

Land reform has begun in the enormous territory of Russia. The goal of the reform is for land to finally find its master. It is necessary to bring back the peasantry of Russia whose labor will provide sustenance for the country.

Voluntary actions and the absence of any coercion and duress are the main principles of an agrarian reform.

The laws "On Land Reform" and "On Peasant (Farmer) Farmsteads" adopted by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, the republic program for the implementation of land reform adopted by the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and a number of government resolutions have created a legal foundation for the extensive development of farms, fruit and vegetable gardening, and animal husbandry.

A rapid process of creating peasant farms is under way in the republic, despite predictions to the effect that the creation of a new arrangement is impossible. The number of peasant farms has increased from 2,500 to 8,400 in the last two months. About 10,000 petitions are being considered by local organs. The introduction of collective-shared property on kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] is proceeding vigorously in many regions.

Under the circumstances, the most significant task of the soviets of people's deputies and land-reform committees, that carry out land transformations has been entrusted, is to create favorable conditions and to facilitate the development of the new forms of economic operations as much as possible. It is particularly important not to waste time and to provide land to all who desire it before the beginning of spring field work, and first of all **provide land parcels for fruit and vegetable gardening to citizens no later than 15 April.**

During our meetings with the public in various regions of Russia, we have encountered a situation whereby the people are not aware of who to approach in order to obtain land.

Procedures for obtaining land are as follows.

Residents of kray and oblast seats should file petitions with oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies to receive land for fruit and vegetable gardening lots. Residents of cities and localities reporting to oblasts (krays) should approach the appropriate soviet (rayon or city).

In view of a difficult food-supply situation, we consider it necessary for the kolkhozes and sovkhozes to allocate up to five or seven percent of arable land for transferring it in 1991 to the urban population for growing potatoes and vegetables.

Transferring land to be owned or held for life, with the right to bequeath it, for operating a peasant farm is a special issue.

Procedures in this instance are as follows: Residents of cities and localities who are not employed by agricultural enterprises file petitions with the rayon (city) soviet of people's deputies which has jurisdiction over the parcel sought. Decisions to provide land should be made on the basis of these petitions within a month.

Employees of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises who want to leave them to operate peasant farms file petitions with the board (management) of their farms. Samples of all necessary documents are available at the rayon and oblast land-reform committees.

Within one month, the board (management) of an agricultural enterprise must refer its findings to the soviet of people's deputies for an appropriate decision to be made by the soviet.

The consent of kolkhoz and sovkhoz collectives with respect to leaving the farm, and receiving land and a segment of the means of production is not required.

Citizens who disagree with the decisions of soviets may appeal them to the courts.

The land-reform committees should, within the shortest possible periods of time, allocate actual parcels of land and issue necessary documents that certify the title to land on the basis of decisions made by the soviets.

We appeal to the local soviets of people's deputies and the employees of land-reform committees: Petitions by citizens should be considered objectively and without delay. **The right of all citizens to receive land is guaranteed; if this right is infringed upon by anyone, the guilty parties are held accountable under the law which, in particular, provides for fines of up to 3,000 rubles imposed on officials.**

Land reform is scheduled to take several years. However, we appeal to those on whom the implementation of the reform depends to take the measures needed for those who desire land to receive it and use it to increase the output of foodstuffs.

We appeal to all of those who farm, or intend to farm the land, regardless of the form of economic operations, to do everything possible to make the spring of 1991 a turning point in the development of Russian agriculture!

Yeltsin's Appeal Rebutted

PM1903151991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[A. Platoshkin article: "Round in Circles"]

[Text] Over the last few days listeners, viewers, and readers have been acquainted with B.N. Yeltsin's utterances. There is plenty in these speeches to really alarm and worry each one of us. Not only Russians. Just take the question of land. The chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet says that those who so wish will obtain land for orchards, truck gardens, and individual farms. Not in the remote future—but this spring. This is of course extremely topical and is bound to delight most of the population.

Incidentally, this also ties up with the USSR president's decree on immediate tasks to implement land reform and with the well-known CPSU Central Committee decisions. I would especially like to stress the latter. Since B.N. Yeltsin's utterances make, to put it mildly, extremely unflattering assessments of the party structures he himself recently belonged.

Take these words: "The tactics of frustrating work, no matter what trouble this causes people, has become the norm for party structures. This is manifested in a particularly consistent and systematic manner in the soviets under their influence."

Well, this claim is nothing new today. It is assiduously dragged out at all manner of rallies and in certain publications. But something else has begun to be more clearly noticeable: It no longer has its original effect. Since people are pondering increasingly often: Is it all really like that? Was it the "party structure" or some other structures or forces that shattered the economy and society, and are they to blame for the chaos and devastation that have swept the country? Party apparatchiks, certainly, do not live in the clouds. Their deeds and actions can be assessed.

Just take Aleksey Filippovich Ponomarev. He leads Belgorod Oblast and is confidently maintaining its course despite the storms that are rocking the economy. State orders for food are fulfilled here, and local supply is in fact better than in other oblasts. This does not come easy for A. Ponomarev, obkom [party oblast committee] first secretary and chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies. Democrats charge him with all mortal sins. Why? It looks as if it is because he sacrifices people's interests and does not allow production to be disrupted.

Deputies and labor collectives stood up for him. Since they are well aware that salvation lies not with those who shout louder but with those who know how to organize things.

Orel and Rostov "partocrats" waste no time on composing sundry appeals or petitions, but are engaged in ordinary, humdrum work in close cooperation with local soviets. A few years ago on the CPSU obkom's initiative the people of Orel, for example, did something that may also have sparked off land reform. There are plenty of private [fermerskiy] farms and lease collectives here today. There are already more than 6,000 in Rostov Oblast.

In the country as a whole, there are more than 40,000 peasant and private farms now. The overwhelming majority of these have been set up not despite, but thanks to the help of the so-called party structures.

People can also see something else. There are obviously forces interested in disrupting and disorganizing work, no matter what trouble this may cause society. Let us recall just last fall. Aid from the town to the countryside in harvesting was effectively blocked by these forces. The result this had is also well-known. Despite an unprecedentedly large harvest, the country found itself on starvation rations. Today emissaries from Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities gesture helplessly: The shelves are bare. They blame neighboring oblasts and the "partocracy" for the economic blockade.

Although outside it is spring, the season of renewal, the same passions and accusations are seething.

If things are going round in circles, where will we finally end up?

Scientific

Freight Craft Fails To Dock With Mir Orbiter

LD2103163191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1430 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer] As we have already informed you, comrades, the latest Progress-M freight craft should have docked today with the Mir orbital complex, where Musa Manarov and Viktor Afanasyev have been working for three months. To be more precise, tomorrow is the 110th day of their flight. The docking should have been taking place at exactly this moment. As our special correspondent Leonid Lazarevich has just come into the studio, one can assume that everything was all right, or...[hesitates]

[Lazarevich] [passage omitted] The docking should have taken place at 1728 [1428 GMT] but it did not take place. Evidently, there were some inaccuracies in the work of converging systems. Safety is the main thing in space flights. The system that is designed to avoid a collision between spacecraft took the Progress ship away; it took it to one side. Telemetric information continues to come from it. The cosmonauts seem to be able to observe it; it seems they can see it. There was a conversation with Vladimir Alekseyevich Solovyev, who is in charge of the flight, and he said that at the moment the

Flight Control Center is analyzing all incoming information, thinking, and making decisions, and it is possible that the docking will be set for tomorrow. [passage omitted]

But I would like to tell radio listeners: No, the docking did not take place. But I would like to remind them that it is not the first time that a module has approached—you remember the case before 12 April, I think, when a module approached the station and did not dock with it. Another attempt was made and the docking took place. Well, so far today the Progress ship is in autonomous flight.

Docking Postponed Until 23 Mar

LD2103192891 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—The Progress M-7 space ferry was blasted off on March 19.

Under the ferry's flight programme, two manoeuvres were made for its rendezvous with the Mir space station. But the rendezvous system switched off automatically at a distance of about 500 meters.

The docking of the spacecraft was postponed until March 23.

Baltic Republics

Baltic, Russian Deputy Ministers Discuss Relations

LD2103115991 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Excerpt] Discussions have been held between the deputy foreign ministers of the Baltic states and Russia. At their meeting, the deputy foreign ministers of the three Baltic states and the deputy leader of the Foreign Affairs Department of the Russian Federation stated the necessity of further coordinating mutual cooperation, the main result of which may be the recognition of direct diplomatic relations among the states. Here is the view of Deputy Foreign Minister Ints Upmacis:

[Begin recording] We succeeded in really coordinating our activities. These activities are not only external—in Europe and the world—but are also in relation to the central and state structures of the USSR. This definitely will give us [words indistinct], because undoubtedly the relations between Russia and the USSR Foreign Ministry are much stranger than they are with the three Baltic states. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Party Committee, Commission Head Baltic Fleet

LD2103131291 Kaliningrad Maritime Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] There has been a party conference of the Twice Red Banner Baltic Fleet. For the first time, a party committee and control commission were elected instead of the political organ which formerly led the CPSU organizations in the fleet.

Union Allegedly Dumped Chemical Weapons in Baltic

LD1903164191 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Report on remarks by (Ricardas Baubinas), deputy head of the Institute of Geography and vice president of the Lithuanian Geographic Society, in studio on 18 March]

[Text] At the beginning of March the Lithuanian Geographic Society, in collaboration with the Institute of Geography of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, informed the government and the public at large of the existence of a chemical weapons burial site in the Baltic Sea. We invited (Ricardas Baubinas), to our studio today to provide us with more details on this truly alarming discovery. (Ricardas Baubinas):

Last October the Soviet daily IZVESTIYA carried a brief article about the surprising discovery of a burial site of chemical weapons dating back to the Second World War by a Swedish scientist who was investigating the Baltic Sea. The burial site was located not far from the Swedish coast. The same article pointed out that it remained unclear who had dumped the chemical weapons there. The appearance of third-rank [USSR] Captain (Terskov) on the scene brought an unexpected denouement to the story.

Mr. (Terskov) admitted in a newspaper article several months later that he had personally supervised the dumping of the chemical weapons which had been accumulated on German territory during the years of the Second World War, and following the decision of the Soviet Government in 1947, they were buried in the Baltic Sea. The retired captain also stated that two sites had been chosen for the dumping of the chemical weapons. One of them being 56 miles southwest of the Latvian port Liepaja. This latter detail aroused both enormous interest and concern in this country, since that particular site belongs to Lithuanian territorial waters and is estimated to lie 50 to 60 km west of the popular Lithuanian seaside resort, Palanga.

Since Capt. (Terskov) maintains that 5,000 chemical explosives were dumped in that particular site, we believe it is our duty to inform both our government and the public at large. After all, with a certain part of the Baltic Sea falling under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Lithuania, it simply cannot undertake the responsibility for the possible consequences of such dangerous activities perpetrated by other states. And we believe that the consequences can be very grave indeed since the chemical explosives are gradually eroding with new chemical compounds forming in the process. Besides, their field of dispersion is constantly expanding.

We possess undeniable evidence that the men who loaded the ships in these explosives prior to their burial, as well as fishermen of the island of Bornholm, suffered from acute poisoning.

Exactly 10 years ago a major ecological crisis, perhaps the largest in the Baltic Sea area, took place just off the Lithuanian coast when a tanker split in half during a raging storm, spilling a total of 16,000 tonnes of black oil into the sea. The damage incurred in terms of money was enormous, but worst of all, the balance of the Baltic ecosystem was severely affected, its consequences being felt even today. Asked to compare the consequences caused by the tanker to the threat posed by the dumped chemical weapons, (Ricardas Baubinas) said:

It is indeed a difficult task to give an unequivocal answer to this question due to lack of information. I would like to point out with regret that the Soviet Union has carefully concealed the fact that it had dumped chemical weapons in the Baltic Sea. In (?aquatic) maps there was only a sign indicating the presence of weapon burial sites in the Baltic Sea. The danger of ordinary explosives simply cannot be compared to the threat posed by chemical explosives. Furthermore, we have absolutely no knowledge as to the chemical substances used in the explosives, their projected dispersion on the seabed, or the characteristics of the seabed in that particular area.

That is why we cannot give a concrete answer to this question or to draw comparisons with other major ecological disasters.

In addition to the ecological aspect of this threat, we single out a political aspect as well. After all, if the Soviet Union agrees that a certain part of the Baltic Sea is to be attributed to the Republic of Lithuania, it should not only provide it with such vital information, but also take real action in order that Lithuania not be held responsible for previous Soviet actions in this particular area.

The official statement released jointly by the Institute of Geography and the Lithuanian Geographic Society reads:

Quote, it is essential to get the Soviet Union to scrap all the dumped explosives and chemical material from Lithuanian territorial waters in the Baltic Sea. Should the Soviet Union itself be unable to fulfil this demand, it must make use of the services rendered by competent foreign firms, unquote.

In the opinion of (Ricardas Baubinas), Lithuania could hardly cope with this unprecedented problem alone:

Of course, we ourselves will not be able to conduct the necessary investigations. We saw our main aim, however, in informing the Lithuanian Government and public about this dangerous situation and demanding appropriate information from the Soviet leadership. I am more than sure that the Institute of Geography of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences could play a positive role in the investigations. That would undoubtedly (?ensue) since it has acquired a wealth of facts about the Baltic Sea over the past 40 years.

As to specific recommendations about the removal of the chemical weapons, I think this can be done only by a group of highly skilled and competent firms or organizations. Even at this point I realize well that such a project requires enormous financial investments, thus it is clear that it will be brought to fruition only if all the Baltic Sea basin countries cooperate. This is but natural since a dangerous threat looms over the entire Baltic Sea area.

Following the publication of this information which had been meticulously concealed from the public at large, it was natural to expect some kind of reaction. So our last question to (Ricardas Baubinas) was what kind of reaction does this alarming news set off? (Ricardas Baubinas):

As far as we know, the reaction was very matter of fact. The Lithuanian cabinet launched an investigation into our statement and took steps to obtain additional information. I've also heard that it sent a special letter to the Soviet Government requiring more details about the entire affair. I think that at present this is the most that we could have done.

(Ricardas Baubinas), deputy director of the Institute of Geography of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences and vice president of the Lithuanian Geographic Society, speaking about the stockpiles of dumped chemical weapons not far from the Lithuanian coast.

Churkin, Center Protest Danish-Latvian Protocol

PM2103133191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by G. Charodeyev: "Danish Ambassador Handed Note"]

[Text] Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, has held a routine briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. He reported that the Danish ambassador in Moscow had been handed a note. It stated that the Soviet side has attentively familiarized itself with the text of the "Joint Protocol on Cooperation Between Denmark and Estonia" signed 11 March 1991 and published in Copenhagen by Danish Foreign Minister U. Ellemann-Jensen and Estonian Foreign Minister L. Meri.

In this connection it was stated that the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is part of the Soviet Union and its status is defined by the Soviet Constitution. The contents of the protocol and, in particular, the raising of the question of "restoring" diplomatic relations with a Union republic run counter to the principles of international law and to Denmark's commitments under the 1975 Helsinki Final Act regarding respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, nonintervention in internal affairs, and nonviolation of the borders of all participants in the CSCE process.

The Soviet side, the note stresses, cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that the 11 March 1991 "Joint Protocol on Cooperation Between Denmark and Estonia" is essentially identical to the 28 February 1991 "Joint Protocol on Cooperation Between Denmark and Lithuania," which was appropriately assessed in the representations made by the USSR Foreign Ministry 8 March 1991 to the Danish ambassador to the USSR. The appearance of this document gives reason to believe that the Danish side has failed to show understanding for the considerations expressed by the Soviet side, particularly with regard to the fact that the development of Danish relations with a Union republic—in this instance the Lithuanian SSR—is possible within the framework of the Soviet Constitution. Consequently, the current step by the Danish side cannot be seen other than as an unfriendly move with regard to the Soviet Union.

"It was stated," V. Churkin went on to say, "that, according to information received, the Danes have also signed a similar protocol with the Latvian SSR. The Danish side was also told that its actions are damaging to the normal course of Soviet-Danish relations. If amendments are not made to the current line, we will be compelled to consider retaliatory measures..."

This IZVESTIYA correspondent has learned that Denmark has rejected the Soviet Union's protest over the country's signing of cooperation protocols with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Denmark Rejects Soviet Rebuke

LD2103141391 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Denmark is said to be rejecting the rebuke from the USSR concerning the international agreements between Denmark and the Baltics. As we reported yesterday, Janis Jurkans, foreign minister of the Republic of Latvia, has returned from Denmark. He and Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen have signed an international agreement on cooperation, mainly in the humanitarian field. A similar agreement was signed just before by Estonian and Lithuanian representatives on one side and Denmark on the other. In this connection, the USSR Foreign Ministry has expressed a strong protest to Denmark, because the Soviet side is offended by the point in the agreement on the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations between the Baltic states and Denmark as soon as circumstances allow. The foreign minister pointed out that Denmark does not regard this as interference in the internal affairs of the USSR. Uffe Ellemann-Jensen has also invited USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh to visit Denmark, to clarify the Danish policy on relations with the three Baltic states, among other things.

Latvian Deputy Cited on Need for 'Compromise'

PM2103134191 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 3

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Neyland by IAN correspondent Albert Grigoryants; place, date not given: "Talks Needed; USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Neyland (Latvia) Considers Situation in the Baltic in Conversation with IAN Correspondent Albert Grigoryants"]

[Text] [Neyland] The situation is complex. For people advocating moderate and reasonable positions times are hard. I cannot accept much of what our "super-patriots" are doing. I would call them extremists, but I cannot approve the center's actions, either.

For five years we proudly said that the perestroyka process is continuing, that there have been arguments but no casualties. We are not used to bloodshed in peacetime. That is our people's mentality. Heated disputes yes, violence no. But now there have been casualties in Lithuania and Latvia. They will only help those forces which preach the slogan "the worse, the better." Some people believe that destabilization will provide an excuse for presidential rule, others hope that such rule would "awaken" the Lithuanian and Latvian peoples and save them from the illusion that compromise is possible.

I see no solution other than talks and the search for compromise. The fact is that all three Baltic republics are economically very dependent on Russia and the other Union republics. Political relationships could be built on this economic basis, too. Take the EC, for instance. The Swedes are now moving toward it, the Danes, the Norwegians... Life is making them. They are soberly evaluating the pros and cons and can see that the pros prevail. We, too, should get round the negotiating table and weigh up all the pros and cons.

We should undoubtedly preserve our political links with the center and the Union.

The Baltic republics are going through a transitional period. But, unfortunately, each of us may interpret it as we see fit. No one is clear about what kind of period this is. Some aspects of it may be interpreted as a reaction to the many years in which national self-awareness was infringed. There has been an upsurge of emotional national patriotism and of nationalism. This, of course, has exacerbated ethnic relations. I think that both sides could reach agreement, given a sensible policy.

The bloodshed has damaged the communist parties. Many people see them as being made up of those who prompted the conflict with the help of the public salvation committees, the "shadow governments," and the demands for a division of power. Yet there is a chance to reach agreement with the Russian-speaking population. Riga, for instance, has always been an international city.

The center should recognize the Baltic republics' declaration of sovereignty. At the same time, the Baltic republics should repeal a whole series of laws infringing the rights of the non-native population and servicemen. The Army's legal status in these republics could also be defined—that is, numbers, stationing areas, and so forth. An economic union would subsequently be needed.

We have concluded that our presence in the Union Supreme Soviet is necessary. Any step to expand our sovereignty is possible by agreement with Moscow.

Now to turn to the commissions set up to hold talks with the three Baltic republics. I think that this is a good thing, because even the worst kind of talks are better than confrontation.

Number of Participants in Latvia Poll Noted

LD2103170191 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] As reported by the foreign media, 367,000 residents took part in the USSR referendum on the territory of Latvia, but Soviet mass media predicted—called the number—half a million. As the organizers of the USSR referendum report, in Estonia, our northern neighbor, 250,000 residents took part in this voting.

Latvian National Minorities Law Well-Received

LD2103142791 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] The first news response testifies that the recently adopted resolution by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, which guarantees rights of cultural autonomy to all national minorities living in Latvia, has been received with satisfaction. Especially highly approved is the point formulated as follows: All residents of Latvia, irrespective of their national allegiance, are entitled to work and wages for work in equal amounts. Any activity is forbidden which, in an overt or covert way, restricts the right of permanent residents to choose a profession or form of occupation dependent on their national allegiance if their abilities or qualifications correspond to that occupation.

The resolution also states that every resident of Latvia, in accordance with his or her own national consciousness, may change or renew documentary records of his or her national allegiance. The leader of the commission on human rights and nationality relations at the Supreme Council, Andrejs Pantelejevs, has explained that at various stages in history it was favorable for many representatives of these minor nationalities to conceal or change their national allegiance. The new law of the Republic of Latvia allows a correction to this historical injustice. Andrejs Pantelejevs also says that the new legislative system invites the creation of a situation where the indication of nationality on documents will no longer lead to any consequences of a juridical nature, as was often the case until now.

Lithuania Seeks 'Working Group' for Moscow Talks

LD2103230291 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] We have learned from unofficial sources that the Lithuanian negotiating delegation wrote a telegram to Soviet Vice Premier Vitaliy Doguzhiyev in answer to his proposal to renew negotiation contacts. Vitaliy Doguzhiyev passes over in silence Lithuania's earlier proposal to renew meetings after the troops withdrew from the occupied buildings. In this connection, the Lithuanian delegation proposes not a full scale meeting between the delegations, but between authorized representatives, who could be called a working group. It is proposed to hold a meeting not in the Kremlin but at Lithuania's mission in Moscow. The reply telegram is expected to be sent tomorrow.

Landsbergis 21 Mar Address on Recent Events

LD2103174391

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 1413 GMT on 21 March, in an unscheduled live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council meeting in Vilnius, carries a 20-minute address by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, on current events in the republic.

Landsbergis begins by mentioning the seizure of the television and radio buildings and states: "The seizure is illegal, and the presence of the Soviet Army there is completely unjustified; it is the seizure of someone else's property. It is a crime. This state of affairs is obvious and cannot be justified. At high-level international talks this is being mentioned, and the Soviet leaders state that these buildings will be returned to the Republic of Lithuania. We have heard more than once such alleged good intentions. But this has been going on almost since the end of January." Landsbergis later says: "This is a double policy. Ways are being sought to set up a Union TV system which would include our property."

Landsbergis continues: "The question arises whether we should not make some more active attempts to solve this problem." Speaking of the OMON, the Special Purpose Militia Detachment, Landsbergis states: "This is either an armed gang acting willfully, or this is a special task. This special task is attacks, provocative attacks against the police, against passersby. Yesterday's incident luckily did not result in many casualities. Cross fire in the city center, shots at the motor vehicle only because someone said something about this vehicle, therefore it must attacked, shot at, stopped— this is a terror atmosphere created in a demonstrative way. This is a situation when an armed gang is not punished.

"Our government tries to solve this issue in direct talks with the military leadership, with the Soviet Union's Government, but we know from experience that these talks may yield results or may not. But it may be that these talks are taking place in order to win time, and meanwhile the events will be escalated. At present we wait each day to hear whether something has happened, has someone been attacked."

Landsbergis goes on: "The question arises whether we as the Supreme Council and deputies should take some step, adopt a legislative line in applying to the legislatures of other countries about it. We have applied more than once asking for intervention, support, or protests against such actions by the Soviet leadership, who speak nicely, explain that tension has decreased in Lithuania, that the Army is being withdrawn from Lithuania, that they strive for negotiations, etc. They deceive some with this talk, and meanwhile planned, destructive work is being carried out here. On the one hand it must discredit the Lithuanian state, which is unable to defend its people, or provoke some defensive acts on our part, and thus begin a conflict and provide a pretext for greater interference. They already say without reason that we are attacking them. If there is some answer on our part, it would be very easy for them to show that really they, poor people, have been attacked.

"Last, the political aim is obvious. When a movement has started toward real support for us, the restoration or establishment of diplomatic relations in one or another form, they wish to create a counterargument that there is no use establishing diplomatic relations with the Lithuanian Government because it does not completely control

the situation in Lithuania." He concludes by saying that the Supreme Council should take steps to check how much irreplaceable property has been destroyed in television and radio premises, and he speaks of some appeal to other countries.

TASS Reports 'Troubled' Night in Vilnius

LD2103183891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius, 21 Mar (TASS)—In the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius, the past night was a troubled one. Automatic and pistol shots rang out in many places in the town.

Boleslaw Vakutynovich, commander of the republican unit of the special militia (OMON) of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, reported to a TASS correspondent that at about 1900, the OMON duty officer received a report from the military commissariat of the town of Salcininkai about a bus containing eight or nine armed people wearing the uniform of soldiers from the department for the defense of the region which was moving in the direction of Vilnius. Two OMON teams who drove out to intercept located the bus and attempted to stop it, but the bus driver did not react to this. During the pursuit, the fighters sitting in the bus broke the rear window and opened fire on the militiamen. When they managed to overtake the bus, the fighters jumped out of it and rushed off in all directions. The OMON officers managed to detain two of them and took them to the military command post at the Vilnius Garrison. On examining one of the cars, OMON discovered several bullet holes, however, no one was injured. The OMON commander stated unequivcally: The OMON side did not fire to hit anyone, and they only shot at the bus wheels with the aim of stopping it.

On the same night, an unknown person fired a pistol at about 0200 at the hotel of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] and Professor Juozas Jermalavicius, a member of the bureau of the LCP Central Committee, and one of the bullets landed in Professor Jermalavicius' room. It is only luck that he survived. The Procuracy of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic has instituted criminal proceedings for the fact that an attempt was made on the lives of Algimantas Naudziunas, a secretary of the Central Committee of the LCP, and Professor Juozas Jermalavicius, a member of the bureau of the Central Committee.

Republican radio and television, reflecting the position of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has presented the bus incident as an arbitrary act on the part of the republican unit of the special militia. It also reports that there are three wounded among those involved. Gediminas Vagnorius, the republic's prime minister characterized this incident at a news conference as "a new crime of the Soviet military, directed toward the further destabilization of the political situation in Lithuania."

Lithuanian Official on Hotel Shooting Incident

LD2103184291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1550 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Summary] During question time at the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, when Procurator General Paulauskas described the known details of yesterday's shooting in Vilnius, deputy Jarmolenka asked him: "Esteemed Procurator, TASS reported today that at about 0200, shots were fired at the Central Committee hotel, could you comment?"

Paulauskas replied: "I can only say that Naudziunas reported in the morning to the police that shots were fired at the windows of the hostel in Psevalskis Street, at the windows of rooms occupied by himself and Jermalavicius. Since we were informed about this by the general militia commissar, we went to the site of the incident with their officials, but were not allowed into the premises. We only had a look from outside; maybe shots were fired, maybe not, I cannot tell. But such a report was made to our police this morning, but not at 0200. It is interesting that shooting took place at 0200 and they only reported it at 1000."

Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Views Pugo Talks

LD1803223191

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 2130 GMT on 17 March broadcasts a 25-minute recorded interview with Zigmas Vaisvila, deputy prime minister of the Repubic of Lithuania, on the meeting he held in Moscow with Soviet Interior Minister Pugo on 15 March.

He starts by saying: "The initiative came from our side, because many problems had built up, both the widely known ones which face only the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] of the Republic of Lithuania—material and technical supply—and some organizational difficulties. For example, since 1 January the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs stopped escort duties for prisoners, even emergency escort duty of seriously ill prisoners. All of this work has come to the MVD of the Republic of Lithuania." He expands on this point, then continues:

"Of course there also were emergency matters, primarily problems of the Special Purpose [Militia] Detachments [OMON] and the subordination of the MVD of the USSR, the confiscation of weapons of our police officers and the very serious circumstance—this has not been widely mentioned either in our press or by television or radio—the fact that for three weeks now our [Lithuanian] MVD has not had access to basic weapons stores; they are guarded by a division of the [Union] MVD. As for demands from our MVD to be given weapons for escorting prisoners and for other [word indistinct] purposes and needs, first they did not react at all—the local representatives of internal troops of the Union did not give out the weapons and did not even respond in writing. The last few days have shown that they had been piling everything on the Ministry of Internal Affairs of

the USSR. Well, we had to talk, because it was not really feasible to have the police unarmed." Having expanded on this, he says: "After stubborn, lengthy insistence on our part, agreement was reached on Friday [15 March] after dinner."

Asked about a division stationed in Vilnius which did not take part in the 13 January television storming, but which is now patrolling, he says: "This division is stationed not only in Vilnius, but also in all the Baltic republics and the so-called Kaliningrad Oblast, and, as we already know, its establishment is being expanded with new subunits in Snieckus and apparently in Kaliningrad Oblast, and there are various regiments stationed not only in Vilnius. Well, as for this division's recent activities, we discussed with them specific questions about the seized buildings. It is not they who seized them, but [words indistinct]. An interesting question arose when we started discussing the possibility of returning those buildings. We discussed possible ways of getting out of the situation that has arisen. We clearly understand that our interlocutors—I mean not the MVD specifically, but the Soviet Union—they also somehow want to get out of the situation that has arisen without losing face, and at the same time probably somehow trying not to spoil relations with the so-called Communist Party of Lithuania. This question is slippery, of course, but to all intents and purposes we parted in a somewhat optimistic frame of mind. We discussed specific possible solutions, although they all depend, of course, not on the Ministry of Internal Affairs, but we understand that our arguments will be passed upward. In discussion we clearly set out our position, and that position was understood."

He is asked about the possibility of having to provide air time for the opposition as part of a compromise, and rejects the prospect. He agrees that the local communists can be considered as Moscow's pawns and that Moscow will decide what happens to them. He goes on to speak favorably of the Baltic representatives' meeting with Baker. Asked what his view was of Pugo as a person, he says that he was struck by the fact that after such a long silence, with no contact with Moscow, there was suddenly quite an amiable conversation. He continues: "We also tried to understand their point of view, but we did not get as far as agreeing on the OMON detachment; this problem is more serious in Latvia. We know almost all the president's orders are carried out, and we can also understand the view of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs that you can't always solve everything with one order.

He expands on the problems with OMON and says the best thing about the talks with Pugo was that the Soviet interior minister presented his views very clearly.

Vagnorius Stresses Economic Links With Center

LD2103155191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] As of 26 March, prices for foodstuffs will be increased in Lithuania. Prime Minister Vagnorius told journalists this at a news conference.

Is the price reform being coordinated with the Union government? What are the prospects for a dialogue between the Governments of Lithuania and the USSR?

Replying to these questions, the prime minister stressed the importance of coordinating the actions of the two governments on economic matters. Vagnorius advocated more intensive bilateral relations, including those at the government-head level.

The seized civilian facilities are the main obstacles blocking a dialogue. The military continues to control them.

Preliminary Vilnius Referendum Results Viewed

PM2203110491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by correspondent Yu. Stroganov under the "Echo of the Referendum" rubric: "They Have Passed the Maturity Test"]

[Text] Vilnius—Participants in the USSR referendum in Lithuania have passed the test of civic maturity, courage, and personal responsibility. After all, each of them, judging by the documents adopted by the republic's legislature, risked being accused of coming out against Lithuania's territorial integrity and statehood...

The preliminary results of the USSR referendum in Lithuania are now known. More than 600,000 people took part in the voting in the republic. Of them 98.98 percent declared themselves in favor of preserving the Union. To be honest, the results surpassed our expectations.

What conclusions can be made on the basis of the preliminary results?

"This is definitely a success," A. Naudzunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, says. "The referendum took place in conditions of terrible pressure. There were many more who wanted to participate in it, but people were afraid."

Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Shuvalov, acting chairman of the USSR legislature's Committee for Culture and a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet group which monitored the referendum's progress in Lithuania, pointed out in conversation with me that forces opposing the continued existence of Lithuania within the Soviet Union attempted to influence the precinct commissions' work.

The following fact bears witness to the situation which has developed. Even the legislative mission of the above-mentioned group got this reaction from Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman V. Landsbergis: "We do not know what they are charged with doing, as their role as observers is defined as prosecutor's oversight, the task of which is to monitor the enforcement of a law which does not apply in Lithuania. In Lithuania only Lithuanian laws apply, and on the basis of a Lithuanian Republic

law on the referendum, no referendum is being conducted at the present time."

In the days of the run-up to the referendum, two explosions rang out in the republic's capital—one by the building where the Vilnius district electoral commission was housed, and the second by the commandant's office. At the same time, rumors did the rounds in the city that militants were massing. Measures were taken to conduct the referendum in normal conditions and to protect the paperwork. Threatening telephone calls were received by those who had instigated the holding of the referendum. Supporters of the Union were given to understand that they might also expect unpleasantness at work. Quite a few observers were noticed surreptitiously "monitoring" the development of this historical event by the polling places. I familiarized myself with one such chart, confiscated from an observer who was detained. It was all clearly marked against times: How many people called into the polling place, the make, color, and license numbers of the cars they drove up in. No more, no less than an intelligence report. For what purpose?

Fortunately, physical confrontation was successfully avoided. But there was a strong atmosphere of moral pressure. You can only surmise how many voters would have taken part in the referendum, had they had an opportunity to express their wills freely, without pressure...

Of the 83,574 inhabitants of Vilnius who voted, only ... 0.1 percent of the capital's voters declared themselves to be against the USSR.

Lithuanian Reaction to Union Referendum Sounded

PM2103162991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel O. Falichev under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Shortsightedness"]

[Text] Vilnius, 20 Mar—We already know a lot about the referendum. Regarding Lithuania, let us remember that more than half a million people here advocated preserving the Union. There is no doubt about the objectivity of this figure, since the name of anyone who voted can easily be checked. But what is now being said about the referendum results by those who doomed it in advance to failure and called it unlawful?

I decided to inquire about this at the headquarters of "Sajudis," at the leadership of what is now called the Democratic Labor Party, which has split from the Lithuanian Communist Party, and in the legislature.

At the "Sajudis" headquarters they called KRASNAYA ZVEZDA antidemocratic and at first did not even want to answer the question. "I am more concerned about the status of your newspaper, not the referendum figure," Andrius Kubilis, responsible secretary of "Sajudis," stated frankly. "As for the referendum results, I believe that they have been falsified, although there are people who wish to preserve the Union..."

Kubilis, however, was quite unable to cite even one fact of juggling or falsification.

One of the leaders of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party found it hard to contain his irritation. "This referendum was not serious, and the figures are just guesswork," V. Gerzonas, Brazauskas' deputy, said in particular. "They do not fit within any framework and are far from the truth..."

P. Palauskas, spokesman for the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Information Service, replied that he was not interested in the result of a so-called referendum held in a foreign state. "The Foreign Affairs Commission might be keeping track of it," he remarked not without irony.

While taking the joke at its true worth, nevertheless I spoke with Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Deputy Arunas Degutis, a member of that commission. "I did not participate in the referendum and do not know its results," he said.

As we see, the reaction of everyone I asked was almost identical. And it boils down to a reluctance to see and hear what is happening round about.

European Parliament Delegation Visits Vilnius

LD2103115291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] A European Parliament delegation headed by Ziegbert Alber, vice chairman of the European Parliament, arrived in Vilnius.

The visit is to carry out the decision adopted by the European Parliament to visit all the Baltic states and to become acquainted firsthand with the situation that has developed there.

The guests from the European Parliament will today visit the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. Tomorrow they will visit Riga. On 23 March they will visit Tallinn.

Meets With Landsbergis, Kuzmickas

LD2103115891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Here is a report by ELTA that we have just received: Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, received a European Parliament delegation headed by Siegbert Alber, vice chairman of the European Parliament, currently on a visit in Lithuania.

Landsbergis acquainted the guests with the year-long history of Lithuania's campaign for freedom, pointing out that currently the aggression of the Soviet Union against Lithuania is continuing. The aim of this is to destablize the situation and to destroy the functioning of

state institutions, while granting Soviet troops both the right to [words indistinct] and to attack the people of Lithuania in the daytime. An atmosphere of terror is being created, the chairman of the Supreme Council points out.

Bronislav Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, drew the attention of the delegation to the fact that stereotypes about Lithuania characteristic of the Soviet propaganda are now more frequently appearing in the Western press. This is nothing but the result of the work of the Soviet propaganda machine, he said.

Members of the European Parliament delegation raised the idea at the meeting that a higher status should be granted to the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Brussels.

Questions concerning further cooperation were discussed.

RSFSR

Khasbulatov Expresses 'Alarm' Over 'Hunger Riots'

LD2203164691 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 22 Mar 91

[By unidentified TASS legislative correspondents]

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS—First Vice Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Ruslan Khasbulatov addressed a joint meeting of the Russian parliament's two houses here today. He expressed alarm about the "hunger riots" that have begun in Sverdlovsk and called for aid to the city from the available scant reserves in order to prevent disorders.

The Russian bill on privatising housing facilities in the federation triggered a heated debate. Submitting the bill, Yefim Basin, head of the parliamentary committee for construction, architecture and communal economy, stressed that it was among the key documents included in the "market package" of legislations, that it created prerequisites for setting up a housing market.

Most deputies, however, objected to the bill, because, in their opinion, it did not guarantee social fairness. Housing will become expensive, they claimed. If the bill is not coersive, why does it include a quota of 2.5 million flats slated for privatisation? There was also the problem of distributing housing on the job, the more so since housing construction has declined. Many deputies moved to put the bill to a republican referendum. But others warned against such a step not to increase social tension which is high as it is.

The first reading of the bill was not approved after a more than two-hour debate. It was decided to resume its discussion in a month.

Another bill, submitted to the Russian parliament today, was devoted to the exoneration of nations subjected to repressions in Russia under the Stalinist regime. This bill rests on international law and on the declaration of the USSR Supreme Soviet of November 14, 1989, to rule unlawful and criminal all repressive acts against nations, subjected to forcible resettlement, and to guarantee their rights. According to member of the Supreme Soviet Andrey Chaikovskiy, this refers to nations numbering approximately 37 million people.

The first reading of the bill is expected to be approved this evening.

Komi Faces 'Extremely Difficult' Food Shortages

LD2203092291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0322 GMT 22 Mar 91

[From the "Mayak Panorama" program]

[Text] A report has come in from the Komi Soviet Socialist Republic about the extremely difficult situation regarding foodstuffs. The Supreme Soviet session taking place in Syktyvkar has proposed that an extraordinary foodstuffs commission be set up in order to stabilize the foodstuffs supplies, at least for this year. Our correspondent, Yevgeniy Zubarev, outlines the situation:

[Begin recording] [Zubarev] People are coming to me at the correspondents' post with the following venomous question: Can you tell us how best to divide up one chicken into 90 parts? This chicken is allocated on a ration card to each resident of Syvtykar instead of pork or beef. Just one single chicken for a whole quarter. I do not know how to divide it up for 90 days. Neither the government nor the Supreme Soviet nor the people's deputies of our republic who gathered today at their routine session could answer this question.

What can you say when it is clear to everyone that many foodstuffs should be delivered here to the north by southern oblasts of Russia and other republics of the country, which will then receive our oil, gas, coal, paper, and sawn timber in exchange. They should do this, but they are not delivering any goods. Now, after many requests, persuasion attempts, and appeals to various quarters, both the leadership of Komi and the people's deputies—strange as it may seem, and although it is a great pity—were forced to switch to the language of an ultimatum.

In the interval of the session, Yuriy Alekseyevich Spiridonov spoke to us:

[Spiridonov] The Union decrees are not effective today. The Union laws are not effective today. In this connection, we have been forced to announce a state of emergency. We are being forced to confiscate part of the output produced at our enterprises today for direct barter operations, either with Union or foreign firms. This is all the more so, since today, in keeping with the direct contracts, the areas yielding agricultural produce are fixing prices in such a way that it is cheaper to buy products abroad than in one's beloved country. In this

respect, we are warning the president. We will make an appeal or write a letter to him. We will inform him. We are forced to do it, because one needs to eat every day. [end recording]

Siberian Gold Mine On Strike for 'Economic Demands'

'Not Connected' to Coal Strikes

LD2103165191 Moscow TASS in English 1637 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fomin]

[Text] Chita, Eastern Siberia March 21 TASS—The Chita region's largest Darasunskiy goldmine is on strike for the second day. The strike is not connected with actions by Soviet coal miners.

Gold miners have advanced only economic demands: higher pay, better equipment for the mine and better supplies with food and consumer goods. Demands include a request to provide children with a guaranteed diet.

The strike is joined by the local geological prospecting expedition, which serves the mine.

Miners Resume Work 22 Mar

LD2203105391 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 22 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fomin]

[Text] Chita March 22 TASS—Following a two-day strike, gold mining has been resumed at all six mines of the Darasun gold field.

The strike committee of the enterprise today decided to suspend the strike. Nevertheless, gold miners continue to stick to all demands addressed to the management and local authorities.

The gold miners intend to resume the strike in a month's time if the food supply of the miners' settlement is not improved, if the material and technical provision of the mines is not normalised, and if wages for all categories of workers are not raised.

Yeltsin Arrives in Leningrad; Talks With Media

LD2103200491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Leningrad, 21 Mar (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, arrived in the city on the Neva today.

He intends to examine current issues at the Lensovet, visit the Kirovskiy Zavod Association, and meet city and oblast leaders, staff members of enterprises and organizations, and representatives of political parties, at the Tauride Palace.

Answering journalists' questions at Pulkovo Airport, Boris Yeltsin said that he is always in a good mood when he comes to Leningrad—the more so now, having been invited by the workers of the renowned Kirovskiy Zavod.

He was asked whether he was pleased with the results of the recent referendum, to which he replied in the affirmative, stressing that the majority voted for a presidency in the Russian Federation. To the question of whether he will run for president, the chairman said he will do so, along with the other candidates.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet 21 Mar Session

WA2203151091

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program
in Russian at 2010 GMT on 21 March broadcasts a 90-minute recording of the proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 21 March.

At 2010 GMT Deputy Kuznetsov proposed that the agenda contain a point on measures to punish those soviets that obstructed the holding of the RSFSR referendum. Deputies speak on this subject and discuss the miners' strike. Deputy Denisenko from the Kuzbass outlines the reasons for the strike and the miners' lack of confidence in the president and his administration. They rightly call for the resignation of Gorbachev, she says.

A deputy from a Chelyabinsk mining region puts forward economic demands. He calls for Pavlov to enter into talks with the miners. He says that the miners have expressed support for Yeltsin, personally.

At 2018 GMT Yeltsin says there is no basis on which soviets can be punished for not holding the RSFSR referendum. A deputy says some measures should be taken. Yeltsin says that there should be a debate on the referendum results as a whole. He gives his opinion briefly on the miners' strike: the RSFSR Supreme Soviet cannot remain indifferent. They should call on Pavlov to hold talks with the miners. He suggests that they adopt a brief decision on this and send it to Pavlov.

Deputies ask further questions about procedures for this. A deputy says that other workers may strike in support of their demands. Yeltsin says that, all the same, Pavlov should enter into talks.

At 2027 GMT a vote is taken on sending a message to Pavlov calling on him to enter into talks with the striking miners. It is passed: 119 for, 17 against, and 10 abstentions. A named vote is taken on the same decision: 131 for, one against, 19 abstentions.

A deputy says people are tired of the confrontation and the deputies should call on the workers to go back to work immediately. Khasbulatov talks about the preparations for the coming congress and the preparations for the Union treaty. He says it would be best to circulate the

draft when it is ready. The Federation Council has been discussing the draft treaty which is a very complicated matter that has involved a vast amount of work. He adds that this continues.

At 2037 GMT Zakharov of the social policy commission puts forward proposals for social legislation. There are measures to raise the minimum wage to 135 rubles [R]. The minimum level of sick benefit should be 90 percent of the minimum wage. The working week should be reduced to 40 hours because a commitment has already been made to do this. He says there is no need to rush this, it can be done from the start of next year. The minimum length of workers' leave should be raised from 15 working days to 24 working days. Students' grants should be raised to 80 percent of the minimum wage. The costs of raising the minimum wage will be R1.2 billion per year.

At 2057 GMT a deputy speaks in favor of the proposals. He calls for a greater range of benefits for those in need. Another deputy reminds everyone that they are in the middle of an economic crisis. He asks if this is the right time to discuss social programs. The pension fund is already empty. What is the point of adopting a law that cannot be implemented?

Deputy Doyev speaks on behalf of trade unions in favor of increased benefits. RSFSR Finance Minister Lazarev says that the costs will have to be calculated more precisely. The budget is already under great pressure and does not have spare resources for increased spending. The agreement between the government and the unions on raising the minimum wage was just a long-term aim, he says. Yeltsin interjects that the agreement has the force of law. Lazarev continues.

At 2113 GMT a deputy asks how the agreement with the trade unions was reached. Another deputy complains that the Finance Ministry always says there is no money. Lazarev explains how the ministry comes by its revenue. Khasbulatov calls on the deputies to approve laws that increase the republic's wealth and takes a vote on the first reading of the laws, which is passed.

Deputy Kazakov talks about the referendum and cites turnout and voting figures for the Russian poll. Khasbulatov moves onto the second reading of the bill on the state taxation service. A deputy presents the bill. A vote is taken on the second reading: 171 for, three against, and six abstentions. The bill is passed.

At 2132 GMT a deputy presents the second reading of the bill on amendments to the penal code in connection with the press law and calls for the changes made since the first reading to be approved. Several deputies make points from the floor on the amendments. A vote is taken and the bill is passed. Soviet of the Republic: 85 for, three against, two abstentions. Soviet of Nationalities: 74 for, one against, four abstentions.

Khasbulatov takes a vote on an individual deputy's query regarding the powers of deputies: 162 for, 12 against, two abstentions. The decision is passed.

Discusses Social Guarantees

LD2103204191 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS—A very important blueprint of a law giving greater social guarantees to working people was submitted to the Russian parliament today. The bill, one of the key documents in the package of market-forming documents, envisages the increase of minimal wages from 70 to 135 roubles a month. The authors of the document propose to reduce a working week from 41 to 40 hours and to increase minimal paid leaves from 15 to 24 working days.

According to calculations of authors of the document, the increase of minimal wages in Russia will require about 1.2 billion roubles a year.

First Deputy Chairman of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov told people's deputies today about preparations for the Third Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of Russia that opens on March 28. He pointed to the importance of the forthcoming discussion at the congress of the blueprint of the Union treaty and stressed that, in his opinion, Russia should "set an example to other Union republics in endorsing the treaty." Khasbulatov pointed to a close connection between the Union treaty and the federal treaty, the blueprint of which would also be discussed at the congress.

[Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1303 GMT on 21 March carries a similar three-minute report on the Russian Supreme Soviet session, adding that "the main point of the day was the adoption of a resolution demanding that USSR Prime Minister Pavlov at last begin talks with the striking miners."]

Preliminary Results Tallied in Referenda Voting

Republic-Wide Results Reported

LD2003170991 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 20 Mar 91

[BY TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—A total of 70.88 per cent of citizens in Russia, who took part in the Soviet referendum on Sunday, supported a renovated Soviet Union, Chairman of the Russian Federation Central Commission for Referendums Vasily Kazakov told a news conference here today.

He said the results of the referendum have been received from 77 out of 88 constituencies in Russia. Kazakov said 26.93 per cent of participants said "no" to the union question. Some 76.1 per cent of 103 million eligible voters in the republic attended polling stations.

Final results of the union referendum in Russia will be summed up by the central commission on March 25, Kazakov said. He noted that according to the reports already received, only in Sverdlovsk, the Urals, less than a half of the vote (49 per cent) supported retaining the Soviet Union.

Speaking about the Russian referendum, where people were supposed to express their attitude to the introduction of executive presidency in the republic, Kazakov said 75.42 per cent of eligible voters took part in it. A total of 70 per cent of the vote supported the idea of executive presidency in the republic, while 27.89 per cent said "no".

According to article 35 of the Russian Federation Law on referendums, "while holding a referendum on issues concerning adopting, changing or making amendments to the Russian Federation constitution, a decision is considered passed, if over a half of eligible voters in the Russian Federation vote for it". The introduction of presidency in the republic is such an issue, Kazakov said.

On Monday, the Russian parliament presidium passed a resolution explaining that the results of the Russian referendum of March 17, shall be determined "by a majority among citizens of the Russian Federation, who took part in the referendum, on condition that over 50 per cent of eligible voters take part in the referendum".

It is unclear which of the two documents should be the basis for determining the results of the referendum, Kazakov said.

The republican parliaments in North Ossetia, the Chechen-Ingush Republic, Tuva and Tataria decided not to hold the Russian referendum in the republics. A total of 84 constituencies participated in the Russian referendum. The results from 77 constituencies have already been received, Kazakov said.

On the whole, only one serious violation of legislation was reported during the referendum in the Russian federation, Kazakov said. At a polling station in Moscow's Sevastopolsky district, the number of ballot-papers cast exceeded by 346 the number of those handed out by the election commission. The results of the referendum at the polling station are expected to be canceled, Kazakov said.

Figures From Leningrad Okrug

LD2103140991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Results from referenda in various areas of the country continue to come in. Today the results of the Leningrad Okrug commission have been published. About 65 percent of registered voters took part in the USSR referendum, and over 65 percent took part in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic referendum. A total of 50.54 percent voted in favor of the Union, and 42.73 percent voted against. A total of 78.52 percent of those taking part in the voting spoke in favor of introducing a presidency in the Russian Federation.

Mordovia's Voting Detailed

LD2103065891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0400 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] In Mordovia the results of the Union and all-Russian referendum have been summed up. Eighty-four percent of the citizens who had the right to vote took part in the voting. More than 80 percent of those who voted supported preservation of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic. In reply to the question on the Russian referendum, 68.6 percent of the participants gave a positive reply.

Prokofyev on Moscow 'Violations'

LD2103234491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] A news conference by Yuriy Prokofyev, the leader of the Moscow organization of the CP [Communist Party], was carried out at the Moscow city committee of the CPSU today. The party leader gave information on the preliminary results of the Union referendum. As he noted, nine republics, according to the results of the voting, spoke in favor of a renewed Union. On the other hand, no one had any doubts of the outcome of the referendum, because there had been so many violations that they would be sufficient to guarantee a 100 percent successful result.

Suffice it to say that on the day of the referendum, photocopied leaflets with the imprint of the USSR referendum ballots on them were found in the voting booths in the Gagarin Rayon of the city of Moscow alone. The answer no was crossed out on them. Together with this, there were slogans such as: What is at stake is more than life; Russia votes in favor of the Soviet Union; What have we come to, mates; What kind of life are we preparing for our children; Will we permit our common home to be destroyed; Let's say yes to a united Union at the referendum. This is only one of the cases. But, how many were there?

It is no secret to anyone that Chapter 3 of Article 16 of the law on the referendum has been clearly violated. Besides this, an open campaign in favor of the Union was carried out by the Central Television and All-Russian Radio network. We have already informed you of this in our news bulletins.

Commentary on Counting Changes

LD2103155391 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Station commentary]

[Text] The Presidium of the parliament of the Russian Federation has changed the rules of counting votes in last

Sunday's referendum on whether Russia should have its own president. Our commentary:

At first it was announced that the referendum's results would be interpreted as positive only if more than half of all citizens eligible to vote say yes. However, since there was the fear that far from all voters would go to the polls, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation decided that the rates would be counted against the number of voters who took part in the referendum. Incidentally, the same rules applies to the referendum on the future of the Soviet Union also held last Sunday.

One of the reasons why the leaders of Russia's parliament made such a decision was that several regions in autonomous republics said they would not poll their residents on whether the Russian Republic should have its own president.

A detailed analysis of such decisions would take too much time. Besides, it is far more important that a leader of the Russian parliament, Boris Yeltsin, said in a televised address on the eve of the referendum of the 17th March that all decisions not to hold the republican referendum were unlawful. He said that the government bodies that made them violated the constitutional right of each citizen to express one's opinion.

Yeltsin himself is certainly the main contender for the president of Russia and he makes no secret of that. His political rating in the country is rather high and for that reason the question of Russia's future presidency sounded more personified. As a matter of fact, saying yes or no to the introduction of presidency in Russia meant to many saying yes or no to Yeltsin.

According to the early returns, most residents of the republic are for presidency. In Moscow the number of supporters total 78 percent. People's Deputy of the Russian Federation Vladimir (Lishenko) believes that a direct election of the republican president can take place as early as May. He also warns that the parliament of Russia already affected by the confrontation of various political forces may be faced with a crisis.

And still, what was behind the decision of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet to change vote counting rules? Was it the fear for the results of the referendum or the habit of the republican parliament's leaders to change their political bearings too often? Or both?

Presidium 'Reinterpreting' Referendum

PM2003170791

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 March 1991 carries on page 3 of its First Edition a 700-word feature under the headline "Why the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet Presidium Is 'Reinterpreting' the Law on the Referendum Which **Yeltsin Considered Fair....**"

The feature is divided into three parts. It first quotes paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 35 of the RSFSR Law "On the RSFSR Referendum" as follows:

"Decisions on referendum questions are considered adopted if more than half of all RSFSR citizens participating in the referendum cast votes in favor.

"In any referendum on questions of adopting, amending, or supplementing the RSFSR Constitution, decisions are considered adopted if more than half of all RSFSR citizens appearing on the electoral register cast votes in favor."

The second part of the feature is a 100-word excerpt from RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman B.N. Yeltsin's 15 March speech on Radio Rossiya, stating that the RSFSR referendum differed from that of the Union insofar as any decision required the support of half of all legal RSFSR citizens, and not just half of those who participated. Yeltsin is quoted as saying: "I consider this fair."

The final item in the feature is an unattributed commentary under the subhead "However...," which quotes from a "very strangely worded" resolution adopted at the 18 March RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session chaired by First Deputy Chairman R.I. Khasbulatov, "On the Rules for Assessing the Results of the RSFSR 17 March 1991 Referendum," to the effect that "the results of the RSFSR 17 March 1991 referendum shall be established through a majority vote of those participating in the ballot on condition that over half of all legal RSFSR citizens turn out to vote."

The commentary asks: "Why did the Presidium decide to quote paragraph 3 of Article 35 when paragraph 4 is more relevant, given that introducing the post of RSFSR president requires an amendment to the RSFSR Constitution? Why is the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium so ready to transgress a law adopted by the supreme soviet? Finally, why did the estimable Ruslan Imranovich [Khasbulatov] express disagreement with Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] by giving a completely different interpretation to the above section of the article of the law from the head of the Russian legislature?

"We venture to suggest," the commentary goes on, "that it may be connected with the outcome of the referendum," in which 14 of the 16 Russian Federation republics "said no to a Russian presidency." The commentary concludes: "Very blatant and gross violations of the law are clearly visible here, not that that is any surprise: The calling of the referendum itself involved serious violations of the law."

Russian 'Arithmetic' Questioned

PM2203113291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by Ye. Sorokin under the "Well, Well!" rubric: "A Funny Kind of Arithmetic"]

[Text] I never would have thought that the head of the Russian legislature could be so out of touch with laws adopted by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. But, as they say, you can't argue with the facts. Speaking on Radio Rossii 15 March, B. Yeltsin said: "I ask Russians to take one more important circumstance into account. According to the law on the Russian referendum, a decision is considered adopted if half of all citizens eligible to vote, and not just half of those participating in the ballot (as with the Union referendum), cast a favorable vote. This is a significant difference of principle....."

Agreed, it is a significant difference of principle, not only with the Union referendum, but also, as it turned out, with the resolution "On the Rules for Assessing the Results of the RSFSR 17 March 1991 Referendum" adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium 18 March. The resolution notes: "Proceeding from the fact that in line with paragraph 3 of Article 35 of the RSFSR Law 'On the RSFSR Referendum' decisions on referendum questions (except those on adopting, amending, and supplementing the RSFSR Constitution) are considered adopted if over half of all citizens who participated in the referendum cast a favorable vote, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium hereby explains that the results of the RSFSR 17 March 1991 referendum shall be established through a majority vote of those who participated in the ballot, on condition that over half of all eligible RSFSR citizens turned out to vote."

So who is right—the chairman or the presidium? The answer is contained in the resolution itself. After all, introducing the post of president is a question of direct constitutional import insofar as it involves amending Russia's Fundamental Law.

The presidium found itself in that unenviable situation when one violation of the law automatically leads to another. The decision on the referendum, which was not strictly legal, had to be complemented, to put it mildly, by improper activity during the vote counting. By playing at political arithmetic, the Russian legislative big shots obviously seek to protect themselves, just in case the Russian people should return a negative decision in the RSFSR referendum. Nowadays, this is what we call "democracy!"

Prediction 'Did Not Come True'

PM2103143091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent V. Gerasimov: "Inaccurate Prediction"]

[Text] Leningrad, 20 Mar—For several days leading up to the referendum, a "public information campaign" was conducted, as they used to say, in the pages of local newspapers and on television telling people how they should vote. The voter, hopelessly entangled in the contradictory arguments of people engaged in heated battles, was instructed unequivocally: If you cannot make up your mind to oppose the preservation of the Union, do not participate in the ballot at all, or else spoil the ballot paper and take it away with you.

A. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, gave viewers his own prediction: In his opinion, the majority of participants in the ballot would vote against preserving the Union. Having announced at the beginning of the program that he had taken the floor to consult with city inhabitants on how he himself should act, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich went on to devote the bulk of his speech to quite skilled arguments against the referendum and a renewed Union.

The Leningrad City Soviet chairman's forecast did not come true. Preliminary statistics show that 50.54 percent of the participants in the ballot in the city on the Neva said: "Let there be a Union!"

According to an announcement by the Leningrad Oblast District Commission, 69.85 percent of those who went to the polls there expressed a similar view.

Radio Rossii Jammed Before Vote

PM2103150991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 2

[IMA-PRESS Karelian department report: "Wailing Over the Receiver Instead of Russian Radio Broadcasts"]

[Text] On the eve of the referendum inhabitants of Leningrad Oblast's Lodeynoye Pole once again heard the almost forgotten sound of radio "jamming devices." For three hours an anonymous source shut off the block of "Radio Rossii" programs. The chief of the local communications unit said that his department had nothing to do with this and added that manufacturing a low-power device to jam local radio is technically not very complex and in principle within a radio ham's capabilities.

Silayev Addresses Media on Economic Program

PM2203113591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by Irina Demchenko: "New Economic Program"]

[Text] Moscow—On 20 March at a session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Council of Ministers presidiums, Russian Prime Minister I. Silayev delivered a report on the program of actions of the republic's government in 1991-1992 for the transition to a market economy. After the end of the discussion I. Silayev held a news conference.

He said that four groups, including the entire personnel of the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium, had worked on the program.

Silayev said the main principle of this program is that we should realize the transition to a market economy, which is taking place because of our society's present state, will not be smooth, and we must move toward true market reforms.

For this in particular, it will be necessary to make substantial changes to legislation on executive power, expanding its economic rights and freedoms at all levels.

Silayev said the Russian Government intends to create the best conditions for all those who can earn a living. The program provides for a number of substantial tax measures to encourage entrepreneurship. In particular, it is planned to completely free from taxation those company funds that are directed toward expanding production, to introduce changes to criminal legislation which curb the freedom of currency operations, and to create favorable conditions for entrepreneurs and foreign investors.

In agriculture, the gamble will still be on the expansion of individual farms, leasing, and other new forms of economic management. Silayev noted with satisfaction that the government "has seriously miscalculated with the individual farmers": It was planned that by early 1992, there would be about 10,000 of them, but already the number of individual farmers is in excess of 9,000, and approximately the same number are waiting in line for their applications to be examined. That is why it has been decided to reduce the examination time from one month to one week.

Answering a question about the spheres in which the interests of the RSFSR and the central organs of power might clash, Silayev cited the use of resources. In his opinion, on other questions, including those relating to the transfer of enterprises and organizations from Union to republican subordination, it will be relatively simple to reach agreement. But the republics' rights to use the natural resources on their territories, Silayev believes, should be enshrined in the Union treaty. He also announced that by agreement with other republics, beginning next year Russia's trade exchange with them will be at world prices.

The Russian Government's program for the transition to a market economy does not provide for the creation of a Russian republic within the RSFSR, the introduction of any currency other than the ruble, or the complete renunciation of cash dealings, and it will not be called "Russia's Special Path."

New Russian Peasant Party Discusses Platform

PM2103150191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by M. Petrov: "Russian Peasant Party Created"]

[Text] Moscow—For two days the delegates to the first Russian Peasant Party Congress discussed topical questions of the new sociopolitical organization's activity.

The main provisions of its program are as follows. The return of the independent peasant to the political arena. The defense of his political, economic, and social interests. A resolute (but legislative) struggle against administrative-edict methods of managing agriculture. The program, which in places is more like a model of high-flown journalism than a party document, declares the main culprit in our food troubles to be the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) and the CPSU, which for many years pursued a policy of abolishing the peasantry as a class.

The active promotion of the implementation of land reform in Russia was also cited as one of the basic tactical aims of the party. The Russian Peasant Party advocates the immediate implementation of the right of all citizens who want them to orchard and vegetable plots and the granting of the right to every family to construct houses with a plot of land in rural areas. Here it is planned, up to the limit stipulated by the law, to hand over the land free to citizens and only for money over and above that limit.

On the organizational plane the Russian Peasant Party has deviated from a strict super centralized structure and decided to be guided by norms that are more democratic than in the CPSU, for instance. Thus the point on the possibility of expulsion from the ranks of the Russian Peasant Party, initially proposed in the statutes, was removed by a majority of votes.

Having declared that the Russian Peasant Party has been created to build in conjunction with other parties and movements a rule-of-law state on a federative basis—the USSR—the congress recorded in the program, however, that the party intends to be guided by the Russian Constitution and laws.

The congress adopted a number of appeals: to the citizens of Russia, to the forthcoming 28 March Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies, and to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The congress elected the party's leading organs—the Central Committee, board, and auditing commission. The well-known journalist Yu. Chernichenko became chairman of the party.

Deputies View RSFSR Extraordinary Congress

91UN1130A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 11, 20 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by A. Gaspryan on statements by three people's deputies: "The Ordinary Is Extraordinary...: On the Eve of the Russian Congress"]

[Text] **An Extraordinary RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies begins on 28 March. How will events unfold at this forum, which is so important to both Russia and the entire country?**

RSFSR people's deputies propose their own scenarios for the congress.

Dmitriy Volkogonov

First, I believe that an alignment of forces will appear even during the procedural "back room maneuvers" in response to a movement to the right by all of society and the parliament.

Second, the goal of the congress and its chief issue will be an examination [otchet] of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Those who have been in favor of this intend, of course, to lay the entire responsibility for the present state of Russia and for the major historical failure toward which we have been moving for 70 years on a man and a leadership that have been in power for less than one year. The reason is clear: They wish to replace the chairman as a symbol of democratic changes.

And finally, third, is removal possible? Right now it is difficult to say with absolute certainty, but taking into consideration the fact that Yeltsin was not elected to his post on the first attempt and that he only got a very small majority, it is possible in principle. But on the other hand, public opinion of Boris Nikolayevich remains high. And with the beginning of the congress, I expect that the wave of public support will increase even more, and one cannot help but take such support into consideration. Even if those who initiated the convocation of the congress achieve what they want—to remove the current chairman—after the referendum and the probable introduction of the post of president of Russia Yeltsin will naturally be named as the first candidate for the Russian "White House."

So, was it worth undertaking such an expensive meeting as the congress is during the sowing, disorder, and disturbance?..

Sergey Bezberkhiy

The basic idea for convening the congress, it seems to me, was not confrontation and the removal of Boris Yeltsin or even of the six, as it seems now, but in getting the republic out of the economic chaos that exists. In any event we, the deputies groups "organizers of production," have discussed this issue precisely in these terms. Now that Yavlinskiy has left and the 500 days program has not been put into effect, what will happen in its place? We do not need an examination of or the removal of the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet but rather a specific plan for ending the impasse...

Unfortunately, the theme of confrontation sounded in a recent speech by Boris Nikolayevich in KOMSOMOLKA: If they do not dump me, "the six" must go. This means that there will be a struggle around whom to dump—"the six" or Yeltsin. That is undesirable. The main thing is the economic revival of Russia. As soon as goods appear on the shelves, there will be nothing to hold rallies about. That is my point of view as a business manager.

Konstantin Belin

It seems to me that our bloc "Communist Russia" will proceed from real life. Is it necessary to stir up already complex political relations? Today we need to analyze all questions more peacefully, particularly economic questions. After all, the disputes have gone so far that the voters no longer understand anything: Whether we are defending their interests or whether two currents—democrats and communists—have entered into a political struggle.

But the discussion at the congress will be very bitter. And there will be some reaction to the fact that the agenda designates a report from the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet instead of an examination of him. We need for the position of the chairman himself to be more clearly expressed. The success in reaching an accord depends on how much it will correspond with the opinion of the various parties. Judging by the speeches in the press, there is presently no consensus.

I would like for our congress to become at least a congress of reconciliation. This is the main thing, and it is independent of whether there will be an examination of the chairman or a report.

Western Republics

Tajikistan Introduces Joint Venture With U.S.

LD2103103491 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TADZHIKTA-TASS correspondent Valeriy Zhukov]

[Text] Dushanbe March 21 TASS—U.S. businessman Moshe Sheetrick, who represents the interests of the American Corin International Ltd and the Kends Hill International Inc firms in Tajikistan, promises to provide fashionable cotton wear for people in Tajikistan within three years. He spoke at a ceremony here to introduce a Soviet-U.S. joint venture for the manufacture of consumer goods.

The principle of operation of our joint venture is a closed cycle from cotton growing and processing to the manufacture of finished garments, Sheetrick said.

"On agreement with the republican cabinet of ministers we have been provided with the first 4,500 hectares of land in the republic's north. The land is considered unfavourable for cotton production.

"We are planning to pick not less than 50 metric centners of cotton per hectare here resultant of high-yield imported varieties and drip irrigation," Sheetrick said.

During the first year of the establishment of the joint venture, the processing of cotton and the production of cotton goods will be established in Hong Kong, Israel and a number of other countries where the firms' branches are located.

Subsequently, it is planned to build the joint venture's own cotton ginning, weaving and sewing mills directly in Tajikistan, Sheetrick said.

Ukrainian Minister, Party Leader on Referendum

PM2203115291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov under the "Echo of the Referendum" rubric: "Vote of Working Ukraine"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session has resumed work. The session was addressed by V.F. Boyko, minister of justice and chairman of the Central Republic Commission for the USSR Referendum.

"As the statistics show," he said, "the referendum and poll of the population were very well organized. Of the 37.732 million individuals appearing on the electoral register, 31.504 million citizens received ballots—that is, 83.5 percent of the total number of people on the register. Of the total number of participants in the ballot, 70.5 percent voted to preserve the Union. More people still—80.16 percent—responded positively to the question: 'Do you agree that the Ukraine should be part of a Union of Soviet Sovereign States on the basis of the Declaration of Ukrainian State Sovereignty?' For example, in Donetsk Oblast, 84.6 percent those who participated in the referendum expressed a firm 'yes' in favor of the Union, with that figure reaching 86.3 percent in Lugansk Oblast, 87.6 percent in the Crimean Oblast, 87.9 percent in Khmelnitskiy Oblast... The referendum results in the republic's western region are also revealing. Thus, devotion to the Union was demonstrated by 16.4 percent of voters in Lvov Oblast, 18.2 percent in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast, 19.3 percent in Ternopol Oblast, and 44.6 percent in Kiev."

Indications from the referendum and the poll of the population, although still only preliminary, provide a fairly clear illustration of the tense political struggle.

"In that respect, the result of the election in the working Ukraine is very gratifying," S.I. Gurenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, said at a news conference yesterday. "Above all it proves that the course chosen by the party organizations is correct and logical. We support first and foremost the preservation of the Union as a renewed federal democratic state; second, we favor the kind of federation of sovereign republics which ensures them real independence in solving all questions of state life; and third, we favor the kind of Union in which relations between all its subjects are built on the principles of equality and justice.

"We appealed for a resolute 'yes' to the questions on both ballots—the Union and Ukrainian," Stanislav Ivanovich stressed. "The referendum results indisputably confirm the correctness of our policy."

Ukrainian Leader Receives Romanian Ambassador

LD2103135991 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, Leonid Kravchuk, played host today to the Romanian ambassador in the USSR, Vasile Sandru, upon his request. The ambassador presented the Ukrainian president with a letter from the Romanian prime miniser, Petre Roman, in which he spells out his views on possible joint use of the potential of the two countries in the interests of their peoples.

Caucasus

Armenian 'Indignation' Over Nationalists' Actions

PM2103161991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by correspondent V. Aloyan: "Quiet in Armenia"]

[Text] Yerevan—The National Self-Determination Association has recently launched vigorous activity in Armenia. Its leader, Paruyr Ayrikyan—a man who spent a long time in jail and as an emigre, but was later rehabilitated and elected Armenian people's deputy—has demanded that an immediate referendum, the institution of the post of republic president, and secession from the USSR.

Pluralism of opinion in the republic is now a normal phenomenon; people say and write whatever they like. But some of the National Self-Determination Association's actions have clearly contravened the law. Acts of vandalism in which monuments to Lenin and prominent Armenian revolutionaries were daubed with paint, the seizure of the party gorkom [city committee] building, threats to disrupt the work of the television center if they are not given live air time—all this has provoked the indignation of the majority of the capital's residents, regardless of their political orientation. The point is that Armenia has attained stability at a high price, and no one has any desire to relive last year's dramatic events. The National Self-Determination Association's vigorous opposition to the draft and to young Armenian men serving in the Soviet Army was the last straw. The National Self-Determination Association took soldiers who went AWOL under its wing. This went against the government's demand for them to return immediately to their place of service.

On the evening of 17 March a mob of young people aged 18-20, led by National Self-Determination Association representatives, surrounded the detention center in Kirovakan, demanding that a deserter held there be released. The situation threatened to get out of control.

The authorities agreed to a preemptive step. An extraordinary session of the republic's Supreme Soviet was convened, and the night before Armenian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] forces liberated the former gorkom building, where the Armenian Cultural Center has been housed for the last two months.

The legislature adopted a principled decision on the activity of the National Self-Determination Association. The republic's government was instructed to review its decision to register this organization if the National Self-Determination Association repeats these illegal actions.

Cease-Fire Talks Conducted in Tskhinvali

LD2103205491 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 21 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz March 21 TASS—At the initiative of the all-Union Interior Ministry, talks between the opposing sides on a ceasefire and the stabilisation of the situation in the state of emergency region were held in Tskhinvali, TASS today learnt at the press centre of the emergency committee at the president of the North-Ossetian parliament.

Despite the fact that the opposing sides reached an understanding not to use weapons, single shots were registered in Tskhinvali suburbs last night.

The sides today continued talks with the mediation from all-Union Interior Ministry officers.

The influx of refugees to North Ossetia is growing. Children, women and the aged are daily coming to Vladikavkaz. According to official data, their number has topped 15,000.

Pugo Sends Note to Supreme Soviet on S. Ossetia

PM2103160991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 1

[INTERFAX report: "Boris Pugo on Situation in South Ossetia"]

[Text] Boris Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, has sent an official note to the USSR Supreme Soviet regarding the situation in South Ossetia Autonomous Oblast.

It points out that the situation in South Ossetia is still extremely tense. There are a considerable number of illegal Georgian and Ossetian armed formations in the conflict zone. The city of Tskhinvali is under blockade. Freight is not being delivered because the railroad from Gori (Georgia) has been put out of action. Shipments are not coming in from North Ossetia either because of roadblocks on the Dzhava-Tskhinvali highway.

"Ossetians have almost completely abandoned 28 population centers in South Ossetia Autonomous Oblast because of the constant danger. There have also been cases of citizens of this nationality being forced out by threats in Borzhomskiy, Gurdzhaanskiy, and other rayons in Georgia and from the city of Tbilisi. At the same time Georgians are leaving the conflict zone in droves, abandoning their homes. The total number of refugees is almost 23,000—the number of Georgians and Ossetians is roughly equal, moreover. More than a third of them are children," the note says.

According to preliminary figures, some 44 people—22 Georgians and 22 Ossetians—have died as a result of shooting, 11 being members of the forces of law and order, and 169 citizens have sustained injuries.

B. Pugo also noted that a group of specialists headed by Boris Gromov, his first deputy, has left for Tbilisi and Tskhinvali.

The internal troop grouping in South Ossetia is being reinforced. The number of operational-investigation personnel is increasing; they are investigating 400 crimes.

Georgian Legislature Discusses Referendum, Ossetia

LD2003234291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1659 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] Tbilisi, 20 Mar (TASS)—Those citizens in Georgia who will not be available [to vote] on 31 March, the day of the republican referendum on the issue of restoring its state independence, are given an opportunity to express their attitude from as early as 23 March. A decision on this was adopted at the latest meeting of the first session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, the SAKINFORM agency reports.

The Supreme Soviet introduced some amendments and addenda to the Constitution of Georgia, and adopted a package of normative acts, in particular a law on the abolition of the death penalty for some crimes. From now on it will not be applied in cases of the manufacture and sale of counterfeit money and valuable papers, violation of the rules for currency operations, the theft of state and public property on a particularly large scale, or the taking of large bribes.

The situation that has come about on the territory of "the former South Ossetian autonomous oblast" was discussed at the session. SAKINFORM reports that the participants in the session honored the memory of "those who died in the ongoing fratricidal conflict between the Georgian and Ossetian populations in this region" with a minute's silence.

Georgian Legislators Expel Two CP Deputies

LD2103230791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1952 GMT 21 Mar 91

[Text] Tbilisi, 21 Mar (TASS)—G. Gumbaridze, the former first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party

[CP] Central Committee, and G. Kashakashvili, director of the Rustavi metallurgical works and a deputy representing the Georgian CP, were expelled from the Georgian legislature. Their deputies status was terminated by a decision of the republic's supreme soviet.

It is claimed that G. Gumbaridze was expelled "for dodging the fulfillment of his duties as a deputy" and G. Kashakashvili "for combining his work with his deputy's activities."

The Georgian legislature also adopted a law on liability for violating the established procedure for organizing and holding political actions in front of the buildings of the supreme soviet and government of the republic. The opposition regards it as "an infringement of democratic liberties."

The Georgian legislators considered that a single day, 31 March, is insufficient for holding the republican referendum. In this regard, citizens who on the final day of the month will for any reason be outside the bounds of the republic will be able to express their attitude toward restoring Georgia's state independence, beginning 23 March.

Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Reviews First 100 Days

91US0374A Tbilisi VESTNIK GRUZII in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 1

[Interview with Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet, by VESTNIK GRUZII correspondents Eke Akhalkatsi and Muradi Alashvili; place and date not given: "Justice Will Triumph"]

[Text] **Today is 100 days since the election as chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet of Mr. Zviad Gamsakhurdia, leader of the Round Table-Free Georgia bloc, which was the winner in the multiparty democratic elections. VESTNIK GRUZII correspondents asked him to answer a number of questions in this connection.**

[VESTNIK GRUZII] Batono Zviad, what did the Round Table's election victory mean and what does it now mean to you and what are your goals following your election to the office of chairman of the Supreme Soviet?

[Gamsakhurdia] As you know, democratic multiparty elections, in which Round Table-Free Georgia was the winner, were held here for the first time throughout the Soviet period. We express profound gratitude to each citizen of Georgia who supported us in this struggle and to all those who contributed to the victory of the democratic and freedom-loving forces who set themselves the task of restoring the lost state independence. My entire activity, like that of the whole Georgian legislature, is geared to the accomplishment of this sacred goal, and I am happy that the Georgian people are fully supporting their elected legislature, despite the entire gravity of political and economic circumstances.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What of that which is planned has it been possible to accomplish? What has not been achieved?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is common knowledge that the Georgian legislature defined as the primary task for the transitional period elimination of the consequences of the annexation and is making every effort to accomplish it in all aspects. That the suspension of the USSR Constitution on the territory of Georgia has become a reality, the law on service in the USSR forces has been suspended, a law on the creation of a Republic of Georgia National Guard has been enacted and that local authorities are elected on a democratic basis, which makes it possible to control each specific region individually, may be classed as the most important achievements. In addition, the legislative bases for radical economic reform are being created, which will lead to liberation from economic diktat on the part of the central authorities. It is essential to also mention the growing interest in Georgia on the part of Western observers. A certain success has already been achieved in relations with political, trade and economic, and cultural circles. We aspire to a permanent broadening of international cooperation....

Unfortunately, we have not at this stage succeeded in escaping entirely the center's interference in our country's internal affairs, which was graphically manifested in Shida Kartli and in Tskhinvali, where the alliance of the Soviet Army and the Ossetian terrorists has led to the disarmament of these gangs dragging on and the blood of innocent people being shed in the city. There is starvation, darkness, and destruction there.... The number of Georgian refugees from Tskhinvali has reached several thousand. There are among them Georgians, Armenians, Jews, Greeks, and Ossetians themselves....

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What is your attitude toward the republic's opposition forces, and how, in your opinion, will relations between the Supreme Soviet and the representatives of, say, the National Congress shape up in the future?

[Gamsakhurdia] We recognize the healthy opposition in the republic and are prepared for constructive cooperation on a democratic basis. But as far as the national congress is concerned, we consider it a fiction and a structure devoid of political maturity. They represent political failures in an alliance with the criminal world. They are sponsoring armed gangs and slanderers and creating artificial destabilization in Georgia, thereby inciting and directing dark forces to evil deeds.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] How are relations shaping up with the other republics which are a part of the empire and with foreign countries?

[Gamsakhurdia] The republics which are a part of the USSR should be divided into two camps: those which agree to sign the new Union treaty and those which are categorically opposed to the creation of a Soviet empire.

Proceeding from this, our republic is endeavoring primarily to maintain close and wide-ranging cooperation with the republics which have openly declared to the world their desire to achieve state independence. Our contacts with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] legislature are expanding, and representatives recently made a business trip to Georgia. The positive results of these contacts were reflected in Deputy Gennadiy Sorokin's speech at the Russian Supreme Soviet session.

As far as international relations are concerned, Georgia is greatly interested in the establishment of the closest contacts with the European states, and the idea of a common European home is not alien to us.... The United States has always supported democratic movements, and, following the restoration of statehood, moral support will most likely switch to active political and economic cooperation.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] The establishment in Georgia of the institution of prefects has elicited a certain reaction. How will relations take shape between the prefects and organs of local administration following the municipal elections?

[Gamsakhurdia] The Georgian population has adopted an understanding attitude toward the Supreme Soviet's initiative concerning the introduction of the institution of prefects on the territory of our republic....

The prefect is a local representative of legislative authority and will pursue the policy course that is being followed at a given moment by the republic Supreme Soviet. As far as the relations of the prefect and the sakrebulo (assembly) are concerned, they will represent constructive cooperation between a democratically elected collective body and a leader appointed by the republic legislature.

Proceeding from this, any deviation from the line of democratic government will instantly be corrected on the one hand by the sakrebulo and, on the other, by the republic legislature.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What is your opinion of the ethnic conflicts and their causes?

[Gamsakhurdia] There has not in the centuries-long history of the Georgian state been a single instance of discrimination against national minorities. Even under the yoke of the Russian Empire Georgia never became an arena of interethnic discord. But as of 1921, when Georgia lost statehood and the Bolsheviks began with particular diligence to implement the classical "divide and rule" formula, three autonomous formations emerged immediately here. Speculating on the peoples' national feelings, Moscow acquired an opportunity at the right moment to play the ethnic crisis card. The sole thing the center could not do was conceal the pro-Soviet orientations of the leaders of the "national revival" of the Ossetians and Abkhaz. So the first cause of ethnic conflicts in Georgia is the struggle between the empire and the republic, between reactionaries and democracy.

As the empire weakens, so will the seriousness of the ethnic conflicts abate, and the elimination of the center of tension will depend wholly on the democratic consciousness of the national minorities and the Republic of Georgia's achievement of independence. For their part, the authorities are trying by way of dialogue with the peaceful population to achieve a democratic solution of the conflict.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] How is the formation of the National Guard proceeding? Is everything going according to plan?

[Gamsakhurdia] The formation of a national guard in Georgia is considered a matter of national pride. The draft will begin in May, but even now there have been hundreds of applications from volunteers who wish to serve in the ranks of the guard. Many officers serving in the ranks of the imperial army have expressed a desire to cooperate with us. The draft lists are now being put in shape, and the logistical base is being created. So the work is in full swing!

[VESTNIK GRUZII] How do you conceive of relations with the center in the transitional period?

[Gamsakhurdia] The relations of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet with the central authorities are clearly expressed in the law on the transitional period....

Georgia was never a part of the USSR de jure, and the announcement of a transitional period aims at eliminating the consequences of the annexation. Proceeding from this, there will be confrontation, conflicts, and diplomatic struggle, but we will under no circumstances admit of compromise....

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What, in your view, will be the results of the all-Union referendum?

[Gamsakhurdia] The actual question put to the referendum, its unspoken wording and the possibility of any interpretation of the results of the referendum make the expediency of a forecast questionable.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] As you know, Ruslan Khasbulatov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, has published his draft of a Union of independent states of Europe and Asia, which would be based merely on economic cooperation and, to some extent, in the military defense sphere. Your position on this question?

[Gamsakhurdia] Mr. Khasbulatov's concept of a new territorial arrangement of the Soviet empire is not original. We recall the plans of academician Sakharov, of Moscow Mayor Popov....

The power of the Supreme Soviet in Georgia is power in an annexed country. Until the consequences of the annexation are eliminated, until the Republic of Georgia becomes a subject in international law, we will be unable

to enter into any political alliance. But when Georgia restores statehood, we will establish close political and economic relations with all democratic states.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What is the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet's position in respect to the republic's non-Georgian population?

[Gamsakhurdia] The question of the republic's non-Georgian population is most closely connected with the introduction of the Citizenship Act. The centuries-long experience of administration of the state has confirmed the need for the existence of several levels of sociopolitical rights. The highest of them is the status of citizen, which differs from subject or temporary resident only in the different degree of participation in the country's political life.

The non-Georgian population in Georgia has never experienced social or cultural discrimination, and as far as political rights are concerned, the inhabitants who comply with the requirements of the Citizenship Act concerning, specifically, residence qualifications and language will become citizens of the republic. We will have no big problems in this respect, I believe.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] Georgia's economy is in crisis. How do you conceive of the ways out of it?

[Gamsakhurdia] The economy of Georgia, as a separate subject, does not exist. There is only the all-Union economy, of which the republic economy is a part. The theory of the Union division of labor has made Georgia a citrus appendage of the center. The crisis in Georgia is a crisis of the Union economy as a whole, and in order to save it from economic catastrophe, therefore, the establishment of complete control over the republic's economic potential is essential. But the exercise of control is impossible without its own financial and credit system, without economic boundaries and customs services and without the establishment of direct interrepublic and international economic relations.

A package of laws on enterprise, privatization, banks, property, land... is being drawn up at this time. The question of the return to Georgian ownership of the plants, factories, mines, transport systems, power systems... is being studied.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] As can be seen, the allegedly independent Communist Party of Georgia is now very sure of itself. Evidence of what has been said is the focus of the newspaper TSKHOVREBA, which could not be called anything other than aggressive. Obviously, the confidence of Georgia's communists has increased following the multimillion-ruble assistance rendered them by Moscow. Your opinion?

[Gamsakhurdia] The election promise of the Georgia organization of the CPSU concerning a national platform has remained an election promise, and lies remain their main weapon as yet. Just one example: the central press recently carried a report concerning the transfer to accounts of the republic CPSU organization of R10 million. Georgia's communists flatly denied this and called this report a provocation. But R1.5 million, meanwhile, recently transferred from the center, have suddenly shown up in their accounts....

Agreement had been reached on the transfer of the Central Committee building to the Council of Ministers, which was broken also. On the one hand, they have announced the creation of an independent Communist Party, but on the other, are demagogically declaring the impossibility of total political and economic separation from the CPSU. The former leaders of the Communist Party "accredited" in Moscow are organizing a campaign to discredit Georgia's authorities for the purpose of restoring the former regime.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] How do you conceive of the role of the press in the transitional period? Your expectations of Georgia's journalists?

[Gamsakhurdia] The role of the press in any period is determined by criteria common to all mankind and is connected primarily with the sociopolitical life of the country. It must seek to establish harmonious social relations. The specific nature of the transitional period predetermines the totality of the disinformation campaign. A primary task of the Georgian press is to neutralize this campaign with the aid of a news breach of the blockade that is strangling the republic in a noose of lies and slander.

[VESTNIK GRUZII] What are the Supreme Soviet's plans for the immediate future?

[Gamsakhurdia] The immediate task of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet is the organized election campaign of the local organs of administration. The prefectures and sakrebulo are to be formed and the efficient functioning of the new managerial structures to be secured.

Unfortunately, the conflict in Samachablo is not yet off the agenda, and thousands of refugees have appeared. A clear boundary should be drawn for a solution of this problem between terrorists and the peaceful population. There is no national intolerance between the Georgian and Ossetian peoples, as the central media wish to portray the conflict. The Kremlin and gangs of terrorists are fighting the Georgian people. Our relations with the Kremlin are the subject of another discussion, but we will talk with the gangs of terrorists in the language of the criminal code.... Justice must triumph, always.

Central Asia

Majority Favor Union in Turkmenistan

LD2003171391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent K. Babayev in Turkmenistan; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A few days are left before the official announcement of the results of the referenda held in different republics of our country. You already know unofficial results; they have been widely reported in the press. The official results of the union referendum in Turkmenistan have been summed up.

[Babayev] A meeting of the central republican commission for the USSR referendum took place yesterday. Here are its results: Voting was held at every one of 1,374 polling stations. A total of 1,804,138 people took part in the voting, accounting for 97.7 percent of the electorate. A total of 1,766,584 people voted in favor of preserving the union, that is 97.9 percent of those voting. In short, the republic's population has firmly spoken in favor of preserving the state, in which the destinies of millions of people of different nationalities are entwined.

Alma-Ata City Soviet Elects New Leaders

LD2003232391 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 20 Mar 91

[Text] A regular session of people's deputies of the Alma-Ata City Soviet began its work today. It examined an organizational matter. Comrade Baykanov was released from his duties as chairman of the city soviet in connection with his appointment as state councillor of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. In accordance with the law on local self-management and local soviets of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, Comrade Nazarbayev, president of the republic, proposed Comrade Nurkadilov as chairman of the city soviet. He had been working as chairman of the Alma-Ata City Soviet Executive Committee. In the vote on a secret ballot, his candidacy was supported by the majority of the deputies. Comrade Khrapunov was elected first deputy chairman of the city soviet and chairman of the city soviet executive committee; he had been working as second secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Alma-Ata city committee. At the session Comrade Nazarbayev delivered a speech and answered questions raised by deputies.

Kazakh Legal Official on New Amnesty Law

91US0371A Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Mar 91 p 2

[Report on interview with Kairbek Suleymanov, head of the group of constitutional law aides in the office of the Kazakh SSR president, by TRUD correspondent O. Kvyatkovskiy; place, date of interview not given: "Amnesty in Kazakhstan"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—**By an absolute majority of votes the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet passed the Law "On Amnesty in Connection with the State Sovereignty Declaration Adopted by the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic."**

A TRUD correspondent asked Kairbek Suleymanov, head of the group of constitutional law aides in the office of the Kazakh SSR president, to comment on the document.

[Suleymanov] This law is one more proof of the fact that our republic is truly sovereign; it is not just that we have declared it such.

[Kvyatkovskiy] The amnesty rumor has been spreading for a long time among those whom you would call interested individuals. But the parliament's decision turned out somewhat unexpected for our law-abiding citizens, since the crime situation here in Kazakhstan is rather serious. Are we going to see the return of "the cold summer of 1953"?

[Suleymanov] No, we are not. The crime situation is truly serious. However, both the president and the parliament have decided to extend this merciful and humane act. From the text of the law, though, it is clear that the amnesty covers a rather limited number of people.

[Kvyatkovskiy] Which prisoners are affected by it?

[Suleymanov] It includes participants in the Great Patriotic War and the Afgantsy [Afghanistan veterans], persons decorated with USSR medals and orders—unless they have been stripped of their decorations, women with under-age children unless they have lost their maternal rights, women who are pregnant at the time of the revision of the amnesty materials, men over 60 and women over 55, some categories of under-age persons, first and second group invalids... Apart from the release from prison the law also provides for shorter prison terms and for an amnesty for penalties not requiring imprisonment.

[Kvyatkovskiy] Will the republic law cover Kazakh residents who are serving terms in other parts of the country?

[Suleymanov] Yes, it will. The problem of an amnesty for those individuals will be considered by the Kazakh SSR courts which did the sentencing, according to the information provided by the internal affairs organs.

[Kvyatkovskiy] Thus, our society will soon expand to include those whom we have decided to forgive. But it is no secret that it will be difficult for them to adapt to "civilian life"...

[Suleymanov] The Supreme Soviet has requested that local soviets enforce accurate registration of all released prisoners and provide job placement for them within a one-month period. Some other social protection measures will be taken also. The new law has not been a spontaneous one. It follows the legal reform begun in Kazakhstan. As early as last year, for instance, we passed a decision to set up special local centers for social adaptation.

Kirghiz, Uzbek Leaders Meet To Sign Treaty

PM2003132491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by correspondent K. Bayalinov: "Republic Leaders Met in Osh"]

[Text] The other day Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President Islam Karimov arrived in Bishkek [Frunze] on an official visit. This is the first official meeting of the two leaders since the notorious events in Osh, which seriously overshadowed Kirghiz-Uzbek relations. Today the situation has been normalized. Evidently, it is no accident that the city of Osh, where from time immemorial representatives of the two neighboring peoples have lived and still live side by side, was chosen as the place for the signing of a friendship and cooperation treaty.

Karimov's arrival is doubly significant—the ice of mutual mistrust has melted, and one more step has been taken on the road to establishing an economic and political confederation of Central Asian states.

Apart from the purely political significance, the visit is important because an understanding has been reached on key questions of economic cooperation. Kyrgyzstan needs oil and gas badly, and Uzbekistan needs water and electricity. It turns out that all these questions can be resolved on the spot, without diktat or the participation of central planning bodies.